

AD _____

Award Number: DAMD17-02-1-0584

TITLE: Regulation of BRCA1 Function by DNA Damage-Induced Site-Specific Phosphorylation

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Thomas G. Boyer, Ph.D.

CONTRACTING ORGANIZATION: The University of Texas Health Sciences Center at San Antonio
San Antonio, Texas 78229-3900

REPORT DATE: June 2004

TYPE OF REPORT: Annual Summary

PREPARED FOR: U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command
Fort Detrick, Maryland 21702-5012

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT: Approved for Public Release;
Distribution Unlimited

The views, opinions and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision unless so designated by other documentation.

20041101 050

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 074-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503

1. AGENCY USE ONLY <i>(Leave blank)</i>			2. REPORT DATE June 2004	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Annual Summary (15 May 2003 - 14 May 2004)
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Regulation of BRCA1 Function by DNA Damage-Induced Site-Specific Phosphorylation			5. FUNDING NUMBERS DAMD17-02-1-0584	
6. AUTHOR(S) Thomas G. Boyer, Ph.D.				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) The University of Texas Health Sciences Center at San Antonio San Antonio, Texas 78229-3900 E-Mail: boyer@uthscsa.edu			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command Fort Detrick, Maryland 21702-5012			10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited				12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 Words) <p>BRCA1, a hereditary breast and ovarian specific tumor suppressor, ensures genomic integrity through its control of transcription and repair of damaged DNA. Considerable evidence implicates DNA damage-induced site-specific phosphorylation in the modulation of its biological activity. However, it is not presently clear whether and how the transcription and DNA repair activities of BRCA1 are modulated in response to DNA damage signals. We have engineered and refined a unique combination of biochemical and genetic tools to address this issue. First, we have developed a biochemical means by which to resolve BRCA1-containing complexes involved in transcription from those involved in DNA double-strand break repair. This should render it feasible to identify DNA damage-induced site-specific phosphorylation events with potential functional relevance to the role of BRCA1 in these two processes. Second, we have established fibroblast cultures from brca1-deficient mouse embryos and developed BRCA1-dependent transcription and repair assays based on the use of these cells. This system will expedite the facile and efficient analysis of the effects of targeted BRCA1 mutations at identified or predicted sites of phosphorylation on its transcription and DNA repair activities. Collectively, these studies should illuminate the molecular basis for the caretaker properties of BRCA1.</p>				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Tumor suppressor, BRCA1, DNA repair, transcription				15. NUMBER OF PAGES 79
16. PRICE CODE				
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Unlimited	

Table of Contents

Cover.....	
SF 298.....	
Table of Contents.....	
Introduction.....	1
Body.....	1
Key Research Accomplishments.....	5
Reportable Outcomes.....	6
Conclusions.....	7
References.....	7
Appendices.....	9

INTRODUCTION

BRCA1, a hereditary breast- and ovarian-specific tumor suppressor, functions in the global maintenance of genome stability, and has been implicated in both transcription and DNA double-strand break repair processes. Considerable evidence implicates DNA-damage-induced site-specific phosphorylation of BRCA1 as a critical regulator of its caretaker properties. However, it is not presently known whether and how the transcription and/or DNA repair activities of BRCA1 are specifically modulated in response to DNA damage. We hypothesized that DNA damage-induced site-specific phosphorylation of BRCA1 regulates its transcription and/or DNA double-strand break repair activities. To provide support for this hypothesis, we proposed first to identify ionizing radiation-induced site-specifically phosphorylated residues on BRCA1 in complex with transcription or DNA double-strand break repair activities, and second, to determine the functional consequence of ionizing radiation-induced site-specific phosphorylation on the transcription and DNA double-strand break repair activities of BRCA1. Toward this objective, our research plan encompassed two major objectives. First, we proposed to biochemically purify from human cells, both prior to and following irradiation, distinct BRCA1-containing multiprotein complexes corresponding to the RNA polymerase II holoenzyme and the DNA double-strand break (DSB) repair complex containing the products of the Rad50, Mre11, and NBS1 (Nijmegen breakage syndrome) genes (Rad50/Mre11/NBS1 complex). Second, we proposed to effect direct comparative analyses of wild type BRCA1 and mutant derivatives bearing substitutions at ionizing radiation-targeted residues for their respective abilities to function in BRCA1-dependent transcription and DNA double-strand break repair assays *in vivo*.

BODY

Research Accomplishments:

Technical Objective 1. To identify ionizing radiation (IR)-induced site-specifically phosphorylated residues on BRCA1 in complex with either the RNA polymerase II holoenzyme or the Rad50/Mre11/NBS1 DNA double-strand break repair complex.

Task 1: Months 1-9: To purify distinct BRCA1-containing complexes corresponding to the RNA polymerase II holoenzyme and the Rad50/Mre11/NBS1 DNA double-strand break repair complex both prior to and following IR.

In year one, we achieved the biochemical purification of distinct BRCA1-containing multiprotein complexes implicated in transcription and DNA repair, thereby completing a significant portion of Task 1 of Technical Objective 1. The results of these studies, documented in the first year annual summary statement, were incorporated into a manuscript that has been resubmitted for publication following additional experiments, and which we include as an appendix to this annual summary statement (Please Refer to Appendix 1 – Manuscript Preprint).

In year one, we also identified a novel function for BRCA1 in suppressing the ligand-independent transcriptional activity of the estrogen receptor α (ER α), a principal determinant of the growth and differentiation of breasts and ovaries. This observation arose peripherally as a result of the characterization of BRCA1-containing transcription complexes, and the identification of activities previously linked to ER α . Importantly, we documented that clinically validated BRCA1 missense mutations abrogate this repression activity, thereby suggesting that its ER α -specific repression function is important for the biological activity of BRCA1 in breast and ovarian tumor suppression. Our results revealed BRCA1 to be a ligand-reversible barrier to transcriptional activation by unliganded ER α , and suggested a possible mechanism by which functional inactivation of BRCA1 could promote tumorigenesis through inappropriate hormonal regulation of breast epithelial cell proliferation. These studies offer possible insight into the tissue-specific tumor suppressor function of BRCA1 and could suggest defined molecular targets for future intervention in breast cancer. The results of these findings were published in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences U.S.A* (2001, Vol. **98**: 9587-9592; Please refer to Appendix 2 – Manuscript Reprint) (1), and were also documented in the first year annual summary statement.

Using the purification strategy outlined in the appended manuscript preprint, we have succeeded in purifying distinct BRCA1-containing transcription and DNA repair complexes from HeLa S3 cells following exposure to ionizing radiation, thus completing Task 1 of Technical Objective 1.

Task 2: Months 3-18: To identify IR-induced site-specifically phosphorylated residues on BRCA1 present in purified RNA polymerase II holoenzyme and Rad50/Mre11/NBS1 DNA double-strand break repair complexes by both mass spectrometric analyses and immunoblot analyses using phosphopeptide-specific antibodies.

We are currently engaged in efforts to identify IR-induced site-specifically phosphorylated residues on BRCA1 present in purified RNA polymerase II holoenzyme and Rad50/Mre11/NBS1 DNA double-strand break repair complexes by immunoblot analysis using commercially available phosphopeptide-specific antibodies and also by mass spectrometric analyses. Thus far, we have encountered significant obstacles in the identification of IR-induced site-specifically phosphorylated residues by mass spectrometric-based approaches. The difficulties encountered in this regard most likely derive from the fact that a relatively small fraction of the total cellular pool of BRCA1 is phosphorylated in response to IR. Consequently, the quantity of phosphorylated target protein thus far purified is below the sensitivity limits of our instruments. We are currently engaged in the preparation of additional starting material for these experiments. The process is laborious, time-consuming, and expensive; however, we are confident that the information to derive from the successful completion of these experiments will be crucial to deciphering how targeted phosphorylation of BRCA1 in response to DNA damage alters its functions within the cell. We are therefore currently engaged in efforts to culture and process cells on an even larger scale than previously anticipated. We are confident of the success of the proposed experimental approach, and on this basis we continue to implement our experimental plan so far as resources permit.

Technical Objective 2. To determine the functional consequence of individual IR-induced site-specific phosphorylation events on the DNA double-strand break repair and transcription activities of BRCA1.

Task 1: Months 9-36: To determine the effects of targeted mutations at identified (or predicted) sites of IR-induced phosphorylation within BRCA1 on its ability to effect DNA double-strand break repair by homologous recombination and nonhomologous end-joining following its ectopic expression in Brcal-deficient cells.

As a first approach toward this objective, we initiated the functional characterization of the BRCA1/Rad50/Mre11/NBS1 DNA double-strand break repair complex purified in Task 1 of Technical Objective 1. In so doing, we made the novel discovery that BRCA1, in complex with Rad50/Mre11/NBS1, plays a critical role in the nonhomologous end-joining pathway of DNA double-strand break repair. This observation has significant implications for the role of BRCA1 in the maintenance of genomic integrity. This study was published in manuscript form in *Cancer Research* (2002, Vol. 62: 3966-3970; Please refer to Appendix 3 – Manuscript Reprint) (2), and was also documented in the second year midterm summary statement.

In addition to its novel findings, this study also established a cell-free system that should expedite the completion of Task 1 of Technical Objective 2. More specifically, the *in vitro* complementation system for nonhomologous end-joining described in this study should permit us to assess in a straightforward approach the role of regulatory BRCA1 phosphorylation on its DNA double-strand break repair activities.

Task 2: Months 6-24: To determine the effects of targeted mutations at identified (or predicted) sites of IR-induced phosphorylation within BRCA1 on its ability to control transcription following its ectopic expression in brcal-deficient cells.

As a first approach toward this objective, we have established a BRCA1-dependent transcription-based assay to evaluate the effects of IR-induced site-specifically phosphorylated residues on BRCA1 identified through Task 2 of Technical Objective 1. This assay is based on the functional interaction between BRCA1 and the sequence-specific transcriptional repressor protein ZBRK1. Previously, we showed that BRCA1 is a co-repressor of ZBRK1, a sequence-specific DNA-binding transcriptional repressor of the DNA damage-inducible *GADD45* gene that functions in G2/M cell cycle checkpoint control (3). In addition to *GADD45*, potential ZBRK1 binding sites have been identified in other DNA damage-inducible genes, indicating a prospective global role for ZBRK1 and BRCA1 in the coordinate regulation of DNA damage-response genes (3). Based on these previous observations, we have proposed a model whereby ZBRK1 and BRCA1 coordinately repress a group of DNA damage response genes in the absence of genotoxic stress and, further, that DNA damage-induced cell signals relieve this repression, thereby permitting DNA damage-induced activation of these genes.

The DNA damage-induced cell signals that relieve coordinate repression of DNA damage response genes by ZBRK1 and BRCA1 is likely to involve phosphorylation. In fact, previous studies have revealed that IR-induced protein phosphorylation is required to relieve BRCA1-mediated repression of the *GADD45* gene (4). To facilitate studies designed to determine the effects of targeted mutations at identified sites of IR-induced phosphorylation within BRCA1 on its ability to control transcription, we established a BRCA1-dependent ZBRK1 transcriptional repression assay. This assay is designed to assess the BRCA1-dependent repression function of ZBRK1 in mammalian cells from a reporter template bearing ZBRK1 DNA-binding sites. To establish the utility of this system as a means to study BRCA1-dependent ZBRK1 repression, we used this system as a functional readout during experiments designed to functionally dissect ZBRK1. This study has now been published in manuscript form in *The Journal of Biological Chemistry* (2004, Vol. 279: 6576-6587; Please refer to Appendix 4 – Manuscript Reprint) (5). In this study, we reported the identification and characterization of a novel BRCA1-dependent transcriptional repression domain within ZBRK1 composed of ZBRK1 zinc fingers 5-8 along with sequences in the unique ZBRK1 C-terminus. This C-terminal repression domain functions in a BRCA1-, histone deacetylase-, and promoter-specific manner and is thus functionally distinguishable from the N-terminal KRAB repression domain in ZBRK1, which exhibits no BRCA1 dependence and broad promoter specificity. Significantly, we also found that the BRCA1-dependent transcriptional repression domain on ZBRK1 includes elements that modulate its sequence-specific DNA-binding activity. In addition to demonstrating the utility of this assay to quantify BRCA1-dependent ZBRK1 transcriptional repression, this study also revealed an unanticipated dual function for the ZBRK1 zinc fingers in DNA-binding and BRCA1-dependent transcriptional repression. As such, this study sheds new light on the mechanistic basis by which BRCA1 mediates sequence-specific control of DNA damage-responsive gene transcription.

Our BRCA1-dependent ZBRK1 repression assay may now be exploited to evaluate the influence of IR-induced site-specific phosphorylation of BRCA1 on its sequence-specific co-repressor function. So long as resources permit, we plan to evaluate the influence of IR on the ability of ectopically expressed wild-type BRCA1 to function as a ZBRK1-specific co-repressor. We predict, and will test the possibility, that IR leads to phosphorylation of BRCA1 and consequent relief of ZBRK1-directed repression from the ZBRK1 target reporter plasmid through disruption of the ZBRK1/BRCA1 interaction. Subsequently, we will evaluate BRCA1 derivatives bearing site-directed mutations at sites of IR-induced phosphorylation identified through Task 2 of Technical Objective 1 for their respective abilities to function as IR-reversible co-repressors of ZBRK1. We predict that BRCA1 derivatives bearing mutations at identified sites of IR-induced phosphorylation will function as constitutive ZBRK1 co-repressors through an IR-insensitive interaction with ZBRK1. This assay should therefore provide us with a rapid and facile approach to test the hypothesis that IR-induced site-specific phosphorylation of BRCA1 modulates its transcriptional regulatory activities.

KEY RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHMENTS TO DATE (Year 2 accomplishments underlined).

- Biochemical resolution of distinct BRCA1-containing multiprotein complexes implicated in transcription and DNA repair.
- Novel discovery that BRCA1 mediates ligand-independent transcriptional repression of the estrogen receptor α .
- Novel discovery that BRCA1, in complex with RAD50/Mre11/NBS1, promotes nonhomologous end-joining of DNA double-strand breaks.
- Establishment of a BRCA1-dependent nonhomologous end-joining assay that will expedite studies designed to test the hypothesis that IR-induced site-specific phosphorylation of BRCA1 modulates its DNA double-strand break repair activities.
- Novel discovery within ZBRK1 of functionally bipartite zinc fingers with dual roles in sequence-specific DNA-binding and BRCA1-dependent transcriptional repression.
- Establishment of a BRCA1-dependent ZBRK1 transcriptional repression assay that will expedite studies designed to test the hypothesis that IR-induced site-specific phosphorylation of BRCA1 modulates its transcriptional regulatory activities.

Training Accomplishments:

Currently, I mentor five Ph.D. student candidates, two of which are engaged in research pertaining to the studies described in this summary report. Mr. Wei Tan, a fourth-year Ph.D. student developed the transcription-based repression assay designed to monitor the influence of IR-induced site-specific phosphorylation of BRCA1 on its sequence-specific co-repressor function. Mr. Tan has made substantial progress in elucidating the mechanistic basis by which BRCA1 mediates sequence-specific transcriptional repression through ZBRK1. He has recently published one manuscript on this subject (J. Biol. Chem. 2004, Vol. 279: 6576-6587; Please refer to Appendix 4 – Manuscript Reprint), and he has completed a substantial body of work toward a second that should be submitted within the next several months.

Ms. Amy M. Trauernicht is a third-year Ph.D. student who is working to biochemically fractionate BRCA1-containing transcription and DNA repair complexes from IR-treated cells using the purification strategy developed to achieve Task 1 of Technical Objective 1 and detailed in Appendix 1. Ms. Trauernicht is also following up on our observation that BRCA1 mediates ligand-independent transcriptional repression of the estrogen receptor. She has completed writing an invited review on this subject along with me, which is now in press in the journal Breast Disease (Please refer to Appendix 7

– Manuscript Reprint). She is making substantial progress along both of her research fronts.

REPORTABLE OUTCOMES TO DATE (Year 2 reportable outcomes underlined).

Manuscripts:

1. Zheng, L., Annab, L.A., Afshari, C.A., Lee, W.-H., and Boyer, T.G. (2001). BRCA1 Mediates Ligand-Independent Transcriptional Repression of the Estrogen Receptor. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **98**: 9587-9592. *Please refer to Appendix 2.*
2. Zhong, Q., Boyer, T.G., Chen, P.-L., and Lee, W.-H. (2002). Deficient Nonhomologous End-Joining Activity in Cell-Free Extracts from BRCA1-null Fibroblasts. *Cancer Res.* **62**: 3966-3970. *Please refer to Appendix 3.*
3. Tan, W. Zheng, L., Lee, W.-H. and Boyer, T.G. (2004). Functional dissection of Transcription Factor ZBRK1 Reveals Zinc Fingers with Dual Roles in DNA-binding and BRCA1-dependent Transcriptional Repression. *J. Biol. Chem.* **279**: 6576-6587. *Please refer to Appendix 4.*

Reviews:

1. Lee, W.-H. and Boyer, T.G. (2001). BRCA1 and BRCA2 in Breast Cancer. *The Lancet (Supplement)*, **358**: S5. *Please refer to Appendix 5.*
2. Boyer, T.G. and Lee, W.-H. (2002). Breast Cancer Susceptibility Genes. *Science & Medicine* **8**: 138-149. *Please Refer to Appendix 6.*
3. Trauernicht, A.M. and Boyer, T.G. BRCA1 and Estrogen Signaling in Breast Cancer. Breast Disease. Submitted. *Please refer to Appendix 7.*

Meeting Abstracts:

1. Boyer, T.G., Zheng, L., Annab, L.A., Afshari, C.A., and Lee, W.-H. (2002). Modulation of estrogen receptor function by BRCA1. Era of Hope, Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program. Orlando, Florida.
2. Bromhal, M., Tan, W., Boyer, T.G., and Yew, P.R. (2002). The role of BRCA1-dependent ubiquitination in breast cancer. Era of Hope, Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program. Orlando, Florida.
3. Tan, W. Zheng, L., Chen, P.-L., Lee, W.-H., and Boyer, T.G. (2003). Molecular dissection of a BRCA1-dependent transcriptional repression domain. Mechanisms of Eukaryotic Transcription. Cold Spring Harbor, New York.
4. Trauernicht, A.M. and Boyer, T.G. (2004). Modulation of human estrogen receptor alpha (ER α) function by BRCA1. Nuclear Hormone Receptors. Keystone Symposia, Keystone, Colorado.

Awards:

1. IDEA Award DAMD17-03-1-0272, U.S. Army Dept. of Defense, BCRP, 2003.

CONCLUSIONS

We have succeeded in the biochemical resolution of distinct BRCA1-containing multiprotein complexes implicated in transcription and DNA repair. We have made the novel discovery that BRCA1 mediates ligand-independent transcriptional repression of the estrogen receptor α ; this finding suggests a possible means by which BRCA1 might control breast epithelial cell proliferation, and by implication cancer risk in the breast. We have also made the novel discovery that BRCA1, in complex with Rad50/Mre11/NBS1, promotes nonhomologous end-joining of DNA double-strand breaks. This observation has significant implications for the function of BRCA1 in tumor suppression through its role in the maintenance of genomic integrity. In addition to this novel finding, we have also established efficient and reliable BRCA1-dependent DNA repair- and transcription-based functional assays, the latter of which has permitted us to make the additional novel discovery that ZBRK1, a BRCA1-dependent transcriptional repressor, harbors zinc fingers with dual roles in sequence-specific DNA-binding and BRCA1-dependent transcriptional repression. This finding sheds new light on the mechanistic basis by which BRCA1 mediates sequence-specific control of DNA damage-responsive gene transcription. As long as resources permit, our current efforts are targeted at identifying DNA damage-induced site-specific phosphorylation events with potential functional relevance to the role of BRCA1 in both transcription and DNA damage-repair processes. Hence, we will exploit these BRCA1-dependent DNA repair- and transcription-based assay to analyze of the effects of targeted BRCA1 mutations at identified sites of phosphorylation on its DNA repair and transcriptional regulatory activities. These studies should illuminate further the molecular basis for the caretaker properties of BRCA1.

REFERENCES

1. Zheng, L., Annab, L.A., Afshari, C.A., Lee, W.-H., and Boyer, T.G. (2001). BRCA1 Mediates Ligand-Independent Transcriptional Repression of the Estrogen Receptor. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A* 98: 9587-9592.
2. Zhong, Q., Boyer, T.G., Chen, P.-L., and Lee, W.-H. (2002). Deficient nonhomologous end-joining activity in cell-free extracts from Brca1-null fibroblasts. *Cancer Res.* 62: 3966-3970.
3. Zheng, L., Pan, H., Li, S., Fleskin-Nitikin, A., Chen, P.-L., Boyer, T.G., and Lee, W.-H. (2000). Sequence-Specific Transcriptional Corepressor Function for BRCA1 through a Novel Zinc Finger Protein, ZBRK1. *Mol. Cell* 6: 757-768.
4. Li, S., Ting, N.S.Y., Zheng, L., Chen, P.-L., Ziv, Y., Shiloh, Y., Lee, E.Y.-H., and Lee, W.-H. (2000). Functional link of BRCA1 and ataxia telangiectasia gene product in DNA damage response. *Nature* 406, 210-215.

5. Tan, W., Zheng, L., Lee, W.-H. and Boyer, T.G. (2004). Functional dissection of Transcription Factor ZBRK1 Reveals Zinc Fingers with Dual Roles in DNA-binding and BRCA1-dependent Transcriptional Repression. *J. Biol. Chem.* 279: 6576-6587.

**Biochemical Resolution of Distinct BRCA1-Containing Multiprotein
Complexes Implicated in Transcription and DNA Repair**

Thomas G. Boyer and Wen-Hwa Lee*

Department of Molecular Medicine/Institute of Biotechnology

University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio

San Antonio, Texas 78245 USA

*To whom correspondence should be addressed

Phone: 210-567-7353

FAX: 210-567-7377

NET: leew@uthscsa.edu

Running Title: BRCA1 complexes implicated in transcription and DNA repair

BRCA1, a hereditary breast- and ovarian-specific tumor suppressor, functions in the maintenance of genome integrity and has been implicated in a diverse range of cellular processes including transcription regulation and DNA repair. However, the physical and functional relationship between BRCA1-containing activities involved in these processes remains to be fully deciphered. Here, we report the biochemical resolution of distinct multiprotein complexes comprised of BRCA1 in association with transcription and DNA repair activities. One complex, consisting of BRCA1, NBS1, Rad50, RNA polymerase II, and RNA polymerase II Mediator proteins could be resolved from a second complex comprised of BRCA1, NBS1, Rad50, Mre11, and additional polypeptides. These findings provide biochemical evidence for stable and distinct BRCA1-containing complexes with potential roles in transcription and DNA repair and, furthermore, provide evidence for an interaction of NBS1 and Rad50 with the RNA polymerase II holoenzyme. The presence of BRCA1, NBS1, and Rad50 in distinct complexes raises the possibility that these proteins represent a common core through which transcription and repair activities may be physically and functionally linked.

INTRODUCTION

Hereditary predisposition to early onset breast and ovarian cancer derives principally from germ-line mutations in either of two **B**Reast **C**ancer susceptibility genes, ***BRCA1*** and ***BRCA2*** (1,2). Considerable evidence supports the notion that *BRCA1* is a "caretaker" gene whose encoded product, a 220 kDa nuclear phosphoprotein, functions in the maintenance of

global genome stability (3-6). While the precise biochemical basis for its proposed caretaker function remains unknown, BRCA1 has nonetheless been implicated in both the regulation of transcription and the repair of damaged DNA.

Several lines of evidence support a direct role for BRCA1 in transcription control. First, the carboxyl-terminus of BRCA1 exhibits an inherent transactivation function sensitive to cancer-predisposing mutations (7-9). Second, BRCA1 has been identified as a component of the RNA polymerase II holoenzyme (10). Third, BRCA1 has been reported to interact with a variety of transcriptional activator and/or repressor proteins (11). Finally, BRCA1 activates transcription of genes that encode activities involved in DNA damage-induced cell cycle arrest and/or apoptosis. These include the cyclin-dependent kinase inhibitor *p21* and the **Growth Arrest and DNA Damage-inducible 45 (GADD45)** genes that function in G₁/S and/or G₂/M checkpoint control, and the *bax* gene that functions in DNA damage-induced apoptosis (12-15). Collectively, these observations imply a role for BRCA1 in mediation of DNA damage-induced cell cycle arrest and/or apoptosis through control of gene transcription.

A significant body of experimental evidence also implicates BRCA1 in DNA damage repair. First, BRCA1 is known to undergo alterations in its phosphorylation status and subcellular localization in response to DNA damage (16). Second, *brca1*-deficient mouse embryonic cells are defective in the repair of both oxidative DNA damage by transcription-coupled processes and chromosomal double-strand breaks by homologous and nonhomologous recombination (17,18; Zhong, Q, Boyer, T., Chen, C.-F., Chen, P.-L., and Lee, W.-H. Manuscript submitted). Finally, BRCA1 interacts physically and functionally with the Rad50/Mre11/NBS1 protein complex that participates directly in the repair of DNA double-strand breaks (19).

Thus, while BRCA1 likely participates in the control of transcription and DNA double-strand break repair, at least in part, by virtue of its association with the RNA polymerase II holoenzyme and the Rad50/Mre11/NBS1 complex, respectively, the precise physical and functional relationship between these two sets of interacting proteins remains to be fully defined. With this issue in mind, we have undertaken the biochemical fractionation of human cell extracts to begin to decipher the protein networks through which BRCA1 functions. Our findings demonstrate that BRCA1, together with Rad50 and NBS1, can be isolated in distinct multiprotein complexes characterized by the stable association of these proteins with either transcription or repair activities. These results provide the first evidence for an association of Rad50 and NBS1 with the RNA polymerase II holoenzyme, and raise the possibility that these two proteins, along with BRCA1, represent a common core through which transcription and DNA repair activities may be linked within the cell.

RESULTS

Human HeLa cell nuclear extract was fractionated over Cibacron Hi-Trap Blue Sepharose using a linear gradient of KCl (0.1-1.5 M). Immunoblot analysis of the pre- and post-column extract revealed that the bulk of BRCA1, as well as Rad50, Mre11, NBS1, RNA polymerase II, and human Mediator proteins hSur2 and CDK8 (20) bound quantitatively to the Blue Sepharose matrix (Fig. 1; data not shown). Immunoblot analysis of individual chromatographic fractions revealed a broad elution profile for BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 (Fig. 1; data not shown). By contrast, hSur2 eluted early in the gradient, peaking at ~0.45 M KCl, while Mre11 eluted later, peaking at ~1.2 M KCl.

The presence of BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 in distinct chromatographic fractions corresponding to the peaks of a Mediator subunit on one hand (hSur2) and a double-strand break repair protein on the other (Mre11) led us to ask whether the three former proteins could be isolated in stable association with either of the latter two proteins. To address this question, Blue Sepharose fractions corresponding to the peaks of hSur2 (Fig 1; fractions 5-7) and Mre11 (Fig. 1; fractions 13-15) were pooled separately and subjected in parallel to further fractionation first by DEAE-Sepharose anion exchange and subsequently by Superose 6 gel filtration chromatography.

Immunoblot analysis revealed co-elution of hSur2, BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 during DEAE-Sepharose chromatography of Blue-Sepharose fractions 5-7 (Fig. 2a, lane 1 and data not shown). Superose 6 chromatography of peak DEAE-Sepharose fractions revealed co-elution of BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 in one major peak within the included volume (Fig. 2a; fractions 48-51), and in a second peak which corresponds to the excluded (void) volume of the Superose 6 column (Fig. 2a; fractions 39-42). The included and excluded Superose 6 peaks of BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 could be distinguished by the absence or presence of additional proteins. Specifically, the included peak, which eluted well ahead of the 670 kDa thyroglobulin marker, is characterized by the additional presence of RNA polymerase II holoenzyme components, including the RNA polymerase II large subunit, RPB1, and human Mediator proteins CDK8, Cyclin C, and Med7. Significantly, no Mre11 protein could be detected in these fractions. The excluded peak, by contrast, was characterized by the presence, in addition to BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1, of RNA polymerase II and a substoichiometric level of Mre11; however, little or no hSur2, CDK8, Cyclin C or Med7 could be detected. The presence of Mre11 within the excluded peak likely derives from trace amounts of a BRCA1, Rad50, NBS1, and Mre11-containing complex incompletely resolved in the initial Blue Sepharose fractionation step. The ability of

Superose 6 to resolve this excluded peak containing Mre11 from an included peak of BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 in association with RNA polymerase II holoenzyme components raised the possibility that these two peaks represent stable and distinct multiprotein assemblies.

To determine if BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 all reside in a stable complex with RNA polymerase II holoenzyme components, individual Superose 6 column fractions corresponding to the included peaks of BRCA1, Rad50, NBS1, and holoenzyme components (Fig. 2a; fractions 48-51) were pooled and subjected to immunoprecipitation using an RNA polymerase II large subunit (RPB1)-specific monoclonal antibody, 8WG16 (21). Immunoblot analysis revealed specific co-immunoprecipitation of BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 along with RNA polymerase II and Mediator proteins CDK8, Cyclin C, and Med7 (Fig. 2b). This result demonstrates that these proteins all reside in a single, large molecular-size complex, which likely corresponds to the RNA polymerase II holoenzyme.

To begin to characterize the protein complex that contains BRCA1 in association with Mre11, Blue Sepharose fractions 13-15 were pooled and applied to a DEAE-Sepharose anion exchange resin. Immunoblot analysis of DEAE fractions revealed co-elution of BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 along with Mre11 in a 0.3M KCl step elution (data not shown). Superose 6 chromatography of peak DEAE-Sepharose fractions revealed co-elution of BRCA1, Rad50, NBS1, and Mre11 in one peak within the included volume (Fig. 3a; fractions 47-50), and in a second peak which corresponds to the excluded (void) volume of the Superose 6 column (Fig. 3a; fractions 40-43). The included and excluded Superose 6 peaks of BRCA1, Rad50, NBS1, and Mre11 could be distinguished by the absence or presence of additional proteins. Specifically, the excluded peak is characterized by the additional presence of small amounts of ATM and Rad51, although the bulk of ATM eluted in fractions corresponding to a molecular

size of its monomeric form (Fig. 3). We consider it likely that the excluded peak represents an insoluble protein aggregate, since BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 exhibit a propensity to precipitate from solution into aggregates that are excluded from Superose 6 (T.G. Boyer, unpublished data). Alternatively, the excluded peak could represent either an extremely large soluble protein complex or a protein/nucleic acid complex. Because these issues have not yet been thoroughly resolved, we have pursued analysis of Superose 6 fractions corresponding to the included peak of the BRCA1, Rad50, NBS1, and Mre11 proteins.

To determine if BRCA1, Rad50, NBS1, and Mre11 all reside in a stable complex, individual Superose 6 column fractions corresponding to the included peaks of the BRCA1, Rad50, NBS1, and Mre11 proteins (Fig. 3a; fractions 47-50) were subjected to immunoprecipitation using a Rad50-specific monoclonal antibody, 13B3. Immunoblot analysis revealed specific co-immunoprecipitation of BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 along with Mre11 and at least 10 additional polypeptides (Fig. 3b). This result demonstrates that these proteins all reside in a single, large molecular-size complex.

DISCUSSION

We have undertaken the biochemical fractionation of human cell extracts in an initial effort to decipher the protein networks involved in BRCA1 function. Previous studies have implicated this tumor suppressor in both the control of transcription and the repair of damaged DNA (11). Consistent with these proposed functional roles, biochemical and protein interaction analyses have demonstrated direct and specific interaction of BRCA1 with both transcription and DNA repair activities. For example, it has been demonstrated that BRCA1 interacts individually

with the RNA polymerase II holoenzyme, with Rad51, and with the Rad50/Mre11/NBS1 DNA double-strand break repair complex (10,19,22). Thus, it appears likely that BRCA1 participates in a diverse range of DNA transactions by virtue of its association with these specific transcription and repair complexes. However, at present, the physical and functional relationship between these protein assemblies has remained undefined. We provide biochemical evidence to suggest that these activities, while perhaps linked within the cell, may nonetheless be isolated as distinct and stable macromolecular assemblies. Minimally, the proteins common to both of these identified complexes are BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1.

The simultaneous presence of BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 in distinct multiprotein complexes with apparent transcription and repair functions provides a basis for the functional, and perhaps physical, linkage of these activities within the cell. We envision two alternative possibilities for the association of these two activities. First, these transcription and repair assemblies could represent components of a larger complex within the cell that has undergone fractionation *in vitro* (Fig 4a). Alternatively, these complexes could represent distinct assemblies *in vivo* that, by virtue of shared subunits, are linked functionally (Fig. 4b). For example, a dynamic redistribution of BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 among transcription and repair complexes could effect global alterations in these activities sufficient to meet the immediate physiological demands of the cell. The biochemical basis for such redistribution could involve phosphorylation, a notion consistent with observed alterations in the phosphorylation status and subcellular localization of BRCA1 as a consequence of cell cycle progression or cellular DNA damage (3,16). Detailed biochemical characterization of BRCA1 in association with the transcription and repair complexes identified herein should reveal whether post-translational modification represents a determinant of its interaction properties.

Our identification of both Rad50 and NBS1 in association with RNA polymerase II and transcriptional Mediator proteins represents, to our knowledge, the first demonstration of an interaction of these proteins with the RNA polymerase II holoenzyme. This observation suggests that these proteins may, like BRCA1, be dually involved in transcription and DNA repair. The precise role of these proteins in the control of transcription remains to be defined. However, such a role would not be entirely inconsistent with the observed pleiotropic features associated with an absence of NBS1 activity in Nijmegen breakage syndrome, which include microcephaly, growth and mental retardation, chromosomal instability, immunodeficiency, and a high incidence of hematopoietic malignancy (23). While NBS1 has, apart from its direct role in repair, been implicated in checkpoint control through regulation of ionizing radiation-induced p53 protein levels (24,25), a more direct role for NBS1 in control of gene transcription cannot be ruled out at present. Future analyses should serve to clarify whether and how NBS1 functions in association with the RNA polymerase II machinery to effect alterations in gene-specific transcription.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Protein Purification - HeLa cell nuclear extract (~725 mg) was applied to Cibacron Hi-Trap Blue Sepharose (Amersham Pharmacia) at a concentration of 4.5 mg/ml protein (total of 7 X 5 ml columns; 103.5 mg protein/column) in 0.1M KCl D buffer (20). Columns were washed with four column volumes of 0.1M KCl D buffer and bound proteins subsequently eluted with a linear gradient of 0.1-1.5M KCl in D buffer over a total volume of 40 ml. Blue Sepharose fractions containing the peaks of hSur2 (fractions 5-7) and Mrre11 (fractions 13-15) as determined by

immunoblot analysis were pooled separately, dialyzed into 0.1M KCl D buffer, and processed in parallel as follows. Dialyzed Blue Sepharose fractions were applied to DEAE-Sepharose (10 mg protein/ml of resin) in 0.1M KCl D buffer. Columns were washed with four column volumes of 0.1M KCl D buffer and step-eluted with 0.3M KCl D buffer. Individual DEAE-Sepharose fractions containing the peaks of BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 along with either hSur2 or Mre11 proteins as determined by immunoblot analysis were pooled to a final concentration of 4 mg/ml and subjected to Superose 6 gel filtration chromatography (2 ml per 16 X 500 mm column). Individual Superose 6 column fractions were analyzed by immunoblot analysis and fractions corresponding to selected peaks as indicated were pooled, concentrated on phosphocellulose P-11 using a 0.6M KCl step elution, and subjected to immunoprecipitation analyses.

Antibody Immunoprecipitation - Monoclonal antibodies specific for the RNA polymerase II large subunit CTD (8WG16; ref. 21), human Rad50 (13B3; ref. 19), human p53 (PAb421; ref. 26), and Glutathione S-Transferase (8G11; ref. 19) were individually covalently coupled to protein G-Sepharose using dimethylpimelimidate (27). Superose 6 column fractions containing peaks of BRCA1, Rad50, RNA polymerase II, and Mediator proteins were pooled and incubated in parallel with either 8WG16 (specific) or PAb421 (non-specific control) antibody columns in 0.3 M KCl (1/2) D buffer [(1/2) D buffer is 20 mM HEPES, pH 7.9; 0.2 mM EDTA; 10% glycerol; 5 mM β -mercaptoethanol] for 6 hours at 4° C. Superose 6 column fractions containing peaks of BRCA1, Rad50, NBS1, and Mre11 were pooled and incubated in parallel with either 13B3 (specific) or 8G11 (non-specific control) antibody columns in 0.3 M KCl (1/2) D buffer for 6 hours at 4° C. Column matrices were washed three times with ten column volumes of 0.3 M KCl (1/2) D buffer, once with ten column volumes of 0.1M KCl (1/2) D buffer, and eluted

with one column volume of 0.1 M glycine (pH 2.0). Column eluates were neutralized, subjected to SDS-10%PAGE, and characterized by silver stain or immunoblot analysis as indicated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank P.R. Yew, P. Sung, and N. Ting for advice and comments. This work was supported by NIH grants P01CA30195 and P01CA81020 and the McDermott Endowment fund (W.-H.L.), as well as Department of Defense Grants DAMD 17-01-1-0408, DAMD 17-02-1-0584, and NIH/NCI Grant CA098301-01 (T.G.B.).

REFERENCES

1. Miki, Y., Swenson, J., Shattuck-Eidens, D., Futreal, P.A., Harshman, K., Tavtigian, S., Liu, Q., Cochran, C., Bennett, L.M., Ding, W., Bell, R., Rosenthal, J., Hussey, C., Tran, T., McLure, M., Frye, C., Hattier, T., Phelps, R., Haugen-Strano, A., Katcher, J., Yakumo, K., Gholalimi, Z., Shaffer, D., Stone, S., Bayer, S., Wray, C., Bogden, R., Dayananth, P., Ward, J., Tonin, P., Narod, S., Bristow, P.K., Norris, F.F.J., Helvering, L., Morrison, P., Rostek, P., Lai, M., Barrett, J.C., Lewis, C., Neuhausen, S., Cannon-Albright, L., Goldgar, D., Wiseman, R., Kamb, A., and Skolnick, M.H. (1994). A strong candidate for the breast and ovarian cancer susceptibility gene BRCA1. *Science* **266**, 66-71.
2. Wooster, R., Bignell, G., Lancaster, J., Swift, S., Seal, S., Mangion, J., Collins, N., Gregory, S., Gumbs, C., Micklem, G., Barfoot, R., Hamoudi, R., Patel, S., Rice, C., Biggs, P., Hashim, Y., Smith, A., Connor, F., Arason, A., Gudmundsson, J., Ficenec, D., Kelsell, D., Ford, D., Tonin, P., Bishop, D.T., Spurr, N.K., Ponder, B.A.J., Eeles, R., Peto, J., Devilee, P., Cornelisse, C., Lynch, H., Narod, S., Lenoir, G., Egilsson, V., Barkadottir, R.B., Easton,

F.E., Bentley, D.R., Futreal, P.A., Ashworth, A., and Stratton, M.R. (1995). Identification of the breast cancer susceptibility gene BRCA2. *Nature* **378**, 789-792.

3. Chen, Y., Farmer, A., Chen, C.F., Jones, D., Chen, P.-L., and Lee, W.-H. (1996). BRCA1 is a 220 kDa nuclear phosphoprotein that is expressed and phosphorylated in a cell cycle dependent manner. *Cancer Res.* **56**, 3168-3172.
4. Kinzler, K.W., and Vogelstein, B. (1997). Cancer susceptibility genes. Gatekeeper and caretakers. *Nature* **386**, 761-763.
5. Xu, X., Wagner, K.-U., Larson, D., Weaver, Z., Li, C., Ried, T., Hennighausen, L., Wynshaw-Boris, A., and Deng, C.-X. (1999). Conditional mutation of *Brca1* in mammary epithelial cells results in blunted ductal morphogenesis and tumour formation. *Nature Gen.* **22**, 37-43.
6. Xu, X., Weaver, Z., Linke, S.P., Li, C., Gotay, J., Wang, X.W., Harris, C.C., Ried, T., and Deng, C.-X. (1999). Centrosome amplification and a defective G2/M cell cycle checkpoint induce genetic instability in BRCA1 exon 11 isoform-deficient cells. *Mol. Cell* **3**, 389-395.
7. Chapman, M.S. and Verma, I.M. (1996). Transcriptional activation by BRCA1. *Nature* **382**, 678-679.
8. Haile, D.T., and Parvin, J.D. (1999). Activation of transcription *in vitro* by the BRCA1 Carboxyl-terminal domain. *J. Biol. Chem.* **274**, 2113-2117.
9. Monteiro, A.N., August, A., and Hanafusa, H. (1996). Evidence for a transcriptional activation function of BRCA1 C-terminal region. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **93**, 13595-13599.

10. Scully, R., Anderson, S.F., Chao, D.M., Wei, W., Ye, L., Young, R.A., Livingston, D.M., and Parvin, J.D. (1997). BRCA1 is a component of the RNA polymerase II holoenzyme. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **94**, 5605-5610.

11. Welcsh, P.L., Owens, K.N., and King, M.-C. (2000). Insights into the functions of BRCA1 and BRCA2. *Trends Genet.* **16**, 69-74.

12. Somasundaram, K., Zhang, H., Zeng, Y.X., Houvras, H., Peng, Y., Zhang, H., Wu, G.S., Licht, J.D., Weber, B.L. and El-Deiry W.S. (1997). Arrest of the cell cycle by the tumour suppressor BRCA1 requires the CDK-inhibitor p21(Waf1/Cip1). *Nature* **389**, 187-190.

13. Harkin, D.P., Bean, J.M., Miklos, D., Song, Y.-H., Truong, V.B., Englert, C., Christians, F.C., Ellisen, L.W., Maheswaran, S., Oliner, J.D., and Haber, D.A. (1999). Induction of GADD45 and JNK/SAPK-dependent apoptosis following inducible expression of BRCA1. *Cell* **97**, 575-586.

14. Ouchi, T., Monteiro, A.N.A., August, A., Aaronson, S.A., and Hanafusa, H. (1998). BRCA1 regulates p53-dependent gene expression. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **95**, 2302-2306.

15. Zhang, H., Somasundaram, K., Peng, Y., Tian, H., Zhang, H., Bi, D., Weber, B.L., and El-Deiry, W.S. (1998). BRCA1 physically associates with p53 and stimulates its transcriptional activity. *Oncogene* **16**, 1713-1721.

16. Scully, R., Chen, J., Ochs, R.L., Keegan, K., Hoekstra, M., Feunteun, J., and Livingston, D.M. (1997). Dynamic changes of BRCA1 subnuclear localization and phosphorylation state are initiated by DNA damage. *Cell* **90**, 425-435.

17. Gowen, L.C., Avrutskaya, A.V., Latour, A.M., Koller, B.H., and Leadon, S.A. (1998). BRCA1 is required for transcription-coupled repair of oxidative DNA damage. *Science* **281**, 1009-1012.

18. Moynahan , M.E., Chiu, J.W., Koller, B.H., and Jasin, M. (1999). Brca1 controls homology-directed DNA repair. *Mol Cell* **4**, 511-518.

19. Zhong, Q., Chen, C.F., Li, S., Chen, Y., Wang, C.-C., Xiao, J., Chen, P.-L., Sharp, Z.D., and Lee, W.-H. (1999). BRCA1 is essential for DNA damage response mediated by the Rad50/Mre11/p95 complex. *Science* **285**, 747-750.

20. Boyer, T.G., Martin, M.E.D., Lees, E., Ricciardi, R.P., and Berk, A.J. (1999). Mammalian Srb/Mediator complex is targeted by adenovirus E1A protein. *Nature* **399**, 276-279.

21. Thompson N.E., Aronson, D.B., and Burgess, R.R. (1990). Purification of eukaryotic RNA polymerase II by immunoaffinity chromatography. Elution of active enzyme with protein stabilizing agents from a polyol-responsive monoclonal antibody. *J. Biol. Chem.* **265**, 7069-7077.

22. Scully, R. Chen, J., Plug, A., Xiao, Y., Weaver, D., Feunteun, J., Ashley, T., and Livingston, D.M. (1997). Association of BRCA1 with Rad51 in mitotic and meiotic cells. *Cell* **88**, 265-275.

23. Shiloh, Y. (1997). Ataxia-telangiectasia and the Nijmegen breakage syndrome: related disorders but genes apart. *Annu Rev Genet.* **31**, 635-62.

24. Jongmans, W., Vuillaume, M., Chrzanowska, K., Smeets, D., Sperling, K., and Hall, J. (1997). Nijmegen breakage syndrome cells fail to induce the p53-mediated DNA damage response following exposure to ionizing radiation. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* **17**, 5016-5022.

25. Sullivan, K.E., Veksler, E., Lederman, H., and Lees-Miller, S.P. (1997). Cell cycle checkpoints and DNA repair in Nijmegen breakage syndrome. *Clin. Immunol. Immunopath.* **82**, 43-48.

26. Stephen, C.W., Helminen, P., and Lane, D.P. (1995). Characterisation of epitopes on human p53 using phage-displayed peptide libraries: insights into antibody-peptide interactions. *J. Mol. Biol.* **248**, 58-78.

27. Zhou, Q., Lieberman, P.M., Boyer, T.G., and Berk, A.J. (1992). Holo-TFIID supports transcriptional stimulation by diverse activators and from a TATA-less promoter. *Genes Dev.* **6**, 1964-1974.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. BRCA1 and Rad50 co-elute from Cibacron Blue Sepharose with both transcriptional Mediator and DNA repair proteins. HeLa nuclear extract was applied to a Hi-Trap Blue column at 0.1M KCl, and bound proteins were eluted with a linear gradient of 0.1-1.5M KCl. Aliquots of the on-put nuclear extract (NEXT), the column flow-through (BS FT), and individual chromatographic fractions (numbered) were analyzed by immunoblot analysis using antibodies specific for the proteins indicated on the left of the blot. Fractions corresponding to the peaks of hSur2 (fractions 5-7) and Mre11 (fractions 13-15) were pooled separately and processed in parallel for further chromatographic analyses as indicated.

Figure 2. BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 reside in stable association with RNA polymerase II holoenzyme components. a. Superose 6 gel filtration profile of Blue Sepharose and DEAE-Sepharose fractionated proteins. Pooled Blue Sepharose fractions 5-7 (from Fig.1) were applied to DEAE-Sepharose and peak fractions from a 0.3M KCl step elution containing BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 were pooled and subjected to gel filtration on Superose 6. Aliquots of the on-

put DEAE fraction (Load) and individual column fractions (numbered) were analyzed by immunoblot analysis using antibodies specific for the proteins indicated on the left. Downward-pointing arrows indicate the positions of marker protein peaks. Fractions corresponding to the excluded (void) and included volume of the Superose 6 column are indicated. **b.** Co-immunoprecipitation of BRCA1 and NBS1 with RNA polymerase II holoenzyme components. Superose 6 fractions 48-51 (from **a**) were pooled, concentrated on phosphocellulose using a 0.6M KCl step elution (lanes 2 and 5) and subjected to immunoprecipitation with an RNA polymerase II large subunit (RPB1)-specific monoclonal antibody 8WG16 (lanes 4 and 7), or a p53-specific monoclonal antibody PAb421 (lanes 3 and 6) as a negative control. Immunoprecipitated proteins were eluted from covalently-coupled antibody columns with glycine, subjected to SDS-10%PAGE, and processed either by silver staining (lanes 1-4) or immunoblot analysis (lanes 5-7) with antibodies specific for the proteins indicated on the right. Molecular weight markers are indicated on the left. Lane 1 represents highly purified core RNA polymerase II, only the two largest subunits of which stained visibly on this gel.

Figure 3. BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 reside in stable association with Mre11 and additional polypeptides. a. Superose 6 gel filtration chromatography of Blue Sepharose and DEAE-Sepharose fractionated proteins. Pooled Blue Sepharose fractions 13-15 (from Fig. 1) were applied to DEAE-Sepharose and peak fractions from a 0.3M KCl step elution containing BRCA1, Rad50, NBS1, and Mre11 were pooled and subjected to gel filtration on Superose 6. Aliquots of individual column fractions (numbered) were analyzed by immunoblot analysis using antibodies specific for the proteins indicated on the left. Downward-pointing arrows indicate the positions of marker protein peaks. Fractions corresponding to the excluded (void)

and included volume of the Superose 6 column are indicated. **b.** Co-immunoprecipitation of BRCA1, Rad50, and Mre11 along with additional polypeptides. Superose 6 fractions 47-50 (from **a**) were pooled, concentrated on phosphocellulose using a 0.5M KCl step elution (lanes 1 and 4), and subjected to immunoprecipitation with a Rad50-specific monoclonal antibody 13B3 (lanes 2 and 6), or a GST-specific monoclonal antibody 8G11 (lanes 3 and 5) as a negative control. Immunoprecipitated proteins were eluted from covalently-coupled antibody columns with glycine, subjected to SDS-10%PAGE, and processed either by silver staining (lanes 1-3) or immunoblot analysis (lanes 4-6) with the antibodies specific for the proteins indicated on the right. Molecular weight markers are indicated on the left. The ~95 kDa protein specifically co-immunoprecipitated with anti-Rad50 antibody has been confirmed by immunoblot analysis to be NBS1, as indicated by the elongated arrow.

Figure 4. Schematic models for the association of BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 with transcription and DNA repair complexes. (a) The RNA polymerase II holoenzyme and the Rad50/Mre11/NBS1 DNA double-strand break repair complexes are physically linked *in vivo* to form a larger complex that undergoes fractionation *in vitro* to yield stable and distinct multiprotein assemblies. This model would imply other than a 1:1 stoichiometric ratio of BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 relative to other proteins within the larger complex. Presently, the stoichiometry of these proteins in complex with isolated transcription and repair activities has not been elucidated. **(b)** The RNA polymerase II holoenzyme and the Rad50/Mre11/NBS1 complexes exist *in vivo* as distinct and stable multiprotein assemblies that may be linked functionally by virtue of shared subunits. Shown here is a potential dynamic redistribution of BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 between transcription and repair complexes. Cell-cycle and/or DNA

damage-induced phosphorylation could represent the signal that specifies the association of these proteins with Mre11 and additional DNA double-strand break repair activities. The specific cell signal(s) that directs BRCA1, Rad50, and NBS1 to the RNA polymerase II holoenzyme is unknown.

Fig. 1





Fig. 2



३





Fig. 4



BRCA1 mediates ligand-independent transcriptional repression of the estrogen receptor

Lei Zheng*, Lois A. Annab†, Cynthia A. Afshari†, Wen-Hwa Lee*‡, and Thomas G. Boyer*‡

*Department of Molecular Medicine and Institute of Biotechnology, University of Texas Health Science Center, 15355 Lambda Drive, San Antonio, TX 78245; and †Laboratory of Molecular Carcinogenesis, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

Edited by Robert G. Roeder, The Rockefeller University, New York, NY, and approved June 19, 2001 (received for review April 9, 2001)

Mutational inactivation of BRCA1 confers a cumulative lifetime risk of breast and ovarian cancers. However, the underlying basis for the tissue-restricted tumor-suppressive properties of BRCA1 remains poorly defined. Here we show that BRCA1 mediates ligand-independent transcriptional repression of the estrogen receptor α (ER α), a principal determinant of the growth, differentiation, and normal functional status of breasts and ovaries. In *Brca1*-null mouse embryo fibroblasts and BRCA1-deficient human ovarian cancer cells, ER α exhibited ligand-independent transcriptional activity that was not observed in *Brca1*-proficient cells. Ectopic expression in *Brca1*-deficient cells of wild-type BRCA1, but not clinically validated BRCA1 missense mutants, restored ligand-independent repression of ER α in a manner dependent upon apparent histone deacetylase activity. In estrogen-dependent human breast cancer cells, chromatin immunoprecipitation analysis revealed the association of BRCA1 with ER α at endogenous estrogen-response elements before, but not after estrogen stimulation. Collectively, these results reveal BRCA1 to be a ligand-reversible barrier to transcriptional activation by unliganded promoter-bound ER α and suggest a possible mechanism by which functional inactivation of BRCA1 could promote tumorigenesis through inappropriate hormonal regulation of mammary and ovarian epithelial cell proliferation.

Germline inactivation of the gene that encodes BRCA1 represents a predisposing genetic factor in \approx 15–45% of hereditary breast cancers, and minimally 80% of combined hereditary breast and ovarian cancer cases (1). Functionally, BRCA1 has been implicated in the maintenance of global genome stability (2–4), and the underlying basis for this activity likely derives from its central role in the cellular response to DNA damage, wherein it controls both DNA damage repair and the transcription of DNA damage-inducible genes (5–14).

Because the DNA damage-induced signaling pathways that converge on BRCA1 are likely to be conserved in most cell types, BRCA1 is likely to occupy a fundamental and universally conserved role in the mammalian DNA damage response. Nonetheless, germ-line inactivation of BRCA1 leads predominantly to cancer of the breast and ovary, and the underlying basis for its tissue-restricted tumor-suppressive properties thus remains undefined.

At least two hypotheses have been proposed to explain the tissue-specific nature of BRCA1-mediated tumor suppression, both of which invoke a role for estrogen in either the initiation or promotion of tumor formation (15). According to one model, the tissue-specific tumor-suppressive properties of BRCA1 derive, at least in part, from its response to tissue-specific DNA damage. In this regard, certain oxidative metabolites of estrogen itself have been documented to be genotoxic in nature (16), and BRCA1 may therefore play a role in protecting breast and ovarian tissue from estrogen-induced DNA damage.

A second model, not mutually exclusive with the one described above, to account for the this tissue-specific tumor-suppressive function invokes a role for BRCA1 in the modulation of estrogen signaling pathways and, hence, the expression of hormone-responsive genes. In this regard, BRCA1 has been reported to

inhibit estrogen-dependent transactivation by the estrogen receptor α (ER α) through its direct interaction with ER α (17, 18). BRCA1 has also been reported to enhance androgen-dependent transactivation by the androgen receptor, allelic variants of which modify cancer penetrance in BRCA1 mutation carriers (19–21). Based on its postulated role in the control of nuclear hormone signaling pathways, BRCA1 could therefore influence epithelial cell proliferation and, by implication, cancer risk in tissues such as breast and ovary.

Herein, we describe a role for BRCA1 in mediating ligand-independent transcriptional repression of the ER α . Initial efforts to elucidate the mechanistic basis for this repression reveal that BRCA1 represents a ligand-reversible barrier to transcriptional activation by unliganded promoter-bound ER α . These findings suggest a potential role for BRCA1 in the proliferative control of normal estrogen-regulated tissues and a potential basis by which its mutational inactivation could promote tumorigenesis through inappropriate hormonal responses.

Materials and Methods

Cell Culture. *p53*^{−/−} (*Brca1*^{+/+}) and *p53*^{−/−}; *Brca1*^{−/−} (*Brca1*^{−/−}) mouse embryonic fibroblasts (MEFs) were cultured as described (14). Human MCF7 cells were maintained in DMEM supplemented with 10% FCS. Human BG-1-derived NEO1 and AS4 cell lines were maintained as described (22). Depletion of hormone ligands for nuclear/steroid receptor activation studies was achieved by cell culture in medium containing either 10% charcoal/dextran-treated serum (HyClone) or defined serum replacement 2 (Sigma).

Plasmids and Transfections. Transfection assays were performed by using the following conditions.

Reporter plasmids. Used at 0.5 μ g each, including pTRE(F2)-TK-Luc, pGRE-TK-CAT, pERE-TK-Luc, or pPRE-TK-CAT (23); 0.5 μ g of pGAL4-SV40-Luc containing five GAL4 DNA-binding sites upstream of the minimal simian virus 40 (SV40) promoter, driving expression of the luciferase reporter gene in the pGL2 vector (Promega); and 0.5 μ g of pGAL4-E1B-Luc (24).

Receptor expression plasmids. Used at 1.0 μ g each, including RSV-hTR β , RSV-hGR, RSV-hER α , and RSV-hPR β (23).

BRCA1 expression plasmids. Used at 1.0 μ g each, including pcDNA3.1-BRCA1, pcDNA3.1-BRCA1-A1708E, pcDNA3.1-BRCA1-Q356R, and pcDNA3.1-BRCA1-A1708E/Q356R expressing either human wild-type BRCA1 or familial breast cancer-derived BRCA1 mutants (14).

Abbreviations: ER α , estrogen receptor α ; MEF, mouse embryonic fibroblast; E2, 17 β -estradiol; RT-PCR, reverse transcription-PCR; HDAC, histone deacetylase; ChIP, chromatin immunoprecipitation; AF-1, N-terminal ligand-independent activation function; AF-2, C-terminal ligand-inducible activation function.

*To whom reprint requests may be addressed. E-mail: leew@uthscsa.edu or boyer@uthscsa.edu.

The publication costs of this article were defrayed in part by page charge payment. This article must therefore be hereby marked "advertisement" in accordance with 18 U.S.C. §1734 solely to indicate this fact.

Chimeric activators. Used at 1.0 μ g of GAL4-ER α , generated by an amino-terminal fusion of ER α with the GAL4 DNA-binding domain in pM3 (25); 0.1 μ g of pVP16-GAL4 or pVP16-GAL4-ER α containing ER α amino acids 251–595, as described (26).

MEFs (6×10^4) or BG-1 cells (2×10^5) cultured in ligand-free medium were transfected by Lipofectin-based methods under serum-free conditions. Culture medium was replaced with fresh ligand-free medium 24 h after transfection, and 10 $^{-7}$ M 17 β -estradiol (E2) or 330 nM trichostatin A was added as indicated. Cells were harvested 48 h after transfection for luciferase assay as described (14) or chloramphenicol acetyltransferase (CAT) assay by liquid scintillation counting (Promega).

Reverse Transcription (RT)-PCR Analysis. BG-1-derived cells were cultured in ligand-free medium for at least 5 days, and treated with 10 $^{-7}$ M E2 for 1 h as indicated. Approximately 15 μ g of total cellular RNA was subjected to semiquantitative RT-PCR analysis following a procedure previously described for estrogen-responsive genes (27, 28).

Chromatin Immunoprecipitation (ChIP). MCF7 cells were cultured in ligand-free medium for at least 5 days and treated with 10 $^{-7}$ M E2 for 1 h as indicated. ChIP assays were performed as described (29).

Antibodies. Antibodies used for soluble and chromatin immunoprecipitations and immunoblot analyses were as follows: BRCA1 (mAb 6B4); ER α (rabbit polyclonal antibody HC-20 or mouse mAb D-12, Santa Cruz Biotechnology); CtIP (mAb 19E8); TFIIFH p89 (rabbit polyclonal antibody S-19, Santa Cruz Biotechnology); glutathione S-transferase (MAb 8G11); RNA polymerase II large subunit (mAb 8WG16); cathepsin D (rabbit polyclonal antibody 06-467, Upstate Biotechnology, Lake Placid, NY); pS2 (mouse mAb V3030, Biomeda, Hayward, CA); human progesterone receptor β (mouse mAb PriB-30, Santa Cruz Biotechnology); p84 (mAb 5E10).

Results

BRCA1 has been shown to modulate the ligand-dependent transcriptional activity of specific members of the nuclear hormone receptor family (17–20). However, endogenous BRCA1 present in the transfected cell lines used in previous studies precluded analysis of the effect of BRCA1 on the ligand-independent function of these receptors. Therefore, to more directly assess the role of BRCA1 in nuclear receptor transactivation without competition from endogenous BRCA1, we analyzed a panel of nuclear receptors for their respective ligand-independent transcriptional activities in Brca1-nullizygous MEFs.

A set of minimal thymidine kinase (TK) promoters, each under control of distinct hormone-response elements specific for either the human thyroid receptor β (TR β), the glucocorticoid receptor (GR), the ER α , or the progesterone receptor β (PR β) were individually tested for their respective abilities to direct expression of a reporter gene in the absence or presence of each corresponding receptor (absent ligand) after transfection into Brca1-proficient (Brca1 $+/+$) or Brca1-deficient (Brca1 $-/-$) MEFs (14). Unexpectedly, we observed significant ligand-independent activation of reporter gene expression directed by both the progesterone receptor β and the ER α in Brca1-deficient MEFs compared with Brca1-proficient MEFs (Fig. 1A). By contrast, no ligand-independent stimulation of reporter activity directed by either the thyroid receptor β or the glucocorticoid receptor could be observed in Brca1-deficient MEFs (Fig. 1A). Interestingly, although E2 activated the ER α in both Brca1-proficient and Brca1-deficient MEFs, the relative level of induction observed in Brca1-deficient MEFs was diminished 2-fold




Fig. 1. BRCA1 mediates ligand-independent repression of the receptors for estrogen and progesterone. (A) Brca1 $+/+$ and Brca1 $-/-$ MEFs in hormone-free media were transfected with reporter plasmids (pTK-Luc or pTK-CAT) carrying response elements specific for individual hormone receptors without (–) or with (+) plasmids expressing the human thyroid receptor β (hTR), glucocorticoid receptor (hGR), estrogen receptor α (hER), or progesterone receptor β (hPR). Transfections performed without (–) receptor expression plasmids were performed instead with a molar equivalent of the backbone expression plasmid pRSV. The relative transactivation level represents the fold-increase in transfected reporter gene activity measured in cells cotransfected with a specific receptor expression plasmid relative to the level of transfected reporter gene activity measured in cells cotransfected with the backbone pRSV expression plasmid. Reporter gene activity was first normalized to β -galactosidase activity obtained by cotransfection of an internal control pSV40- β -gal expression plasmid as described (14). Expression of the pSV40- β -gal plasmid was not affected by the absence of presence of BRCA1 or any of the nuclear hormone receptors analyzed (data not shown). (B) Brca1 $+/+$ and Brca1 $-/-$ MEFs in estrogen-free media were transfected with pERE-TK-Luc carrying three copies of the consensus estrogen response element (ERE) with (+) pRSV-ER α in the absence (–) or presence (+) of E2 (10 $^{-7}$ M) before assay for luciferase activity. The relative induction level represents the relative transactivation level measured in the presence of E2 divided by the relative transactivation level measured in the absence of E2. (C) Brca1 $+/+$ (lanes 1–3) and Brca1 $-/-$ (lanes 4–6) MEFs either untransfected (lanes 1 and 4) or transfected (lanes 2, 3, 5, and 6) with an ER α -expressing vector were lysed, and immunoprecipitated ER α was immunoblotted with ER α -specific antibodies (Upper). Immunoblot analysis of the nuclear matrix protein p84 (Lower) indicates that nearly equivalent amounts of each cell lysate were used in the immunoprecipitations.

relative to Brca1-proficient MEFs (Fig. 1B). We confirmed by immunoblot analysis that the transfected ER α was expressed equivalently in BRCA1-proficient and BRCA1-deficient MEFs, thus excluding the possibility that differences in receptor activity derive from differences in receptor protein expression (Fig. 1C).

Ectopic expression of wild-type BRCA1 in Brca1-deficient MEFs repressed ligand-independent activation directed by ER α (Fig. 2A). Likewise, a BRCA1 derivative carrying a familial breast cancer-derived missense mutation in the ring finger (C64G) also repressed ligand-independent activation by ER α (Fig. 2A). By contrast, BRCA1 derivatives carrying familial breast cancer-derived missense mutations in either an exon 11-encoded region that binds Rad50 and the transcriptional repressor ZBRK1 (Q356R) or the C-terminal BRCT domain (A1708E) abolished the ability of BRCA1 to repress ligand-independent transactivation directed by ER α (Fig. 2A). Differences in the transcriptional repression activities of the various BRCA1 mutant derivatives could not be attributed to differences in their respective levels of expression because each of the BRCA1 mutant derivatives was expressed at a level comparable




Fig. 2. Ectopic expression of wild-type BRCA1 in Brca1-deficient MEFs restores ligand-independent repression of ER α transactivation in a histone deacetylase (HDAC)-dependent manner. (A and B) Brca1 $^{-/-}$ MEFs in estrogen-free media were transfected with pERE-TK-Luc without (–) or with (+) pRSV-ER α , pCDNA3.1-BRCA1 expressing wild-type human BRCA1 (WT), or pCDNA3.1-BRCA1 derivatives bearing missense mutants A1708E, Q356R, A1708E/Q356R, or C64G before assay for luciferase activity. Where indicated, trichostatin A (TSA; 330 nM) was also included. (C) Brca1 $^{-/-}$ MEFs in estrogen-free media were untransfected (lane 1) or cotransfected with expression vectors for ER α and either wild-type BRCA1 (lane 2) or various BRCA1 mutant derivatives (lanes 3–6) as indicated. Cells were lysed, and immunoprecipitated BRCA1 and ER α were subjected to immunoblot analysis using antibodies specific for BRCA1 (Top) or ER α (Middle). Immunoblot analysis of the nuclear matrix protein p84 (Bottom) indicates that nearly equivalent amounts of each cell lysate were used in the immunoprecipitations.

to wild-type BRCA1 (Fig. 2C). BRCA1-mediated, ligand-independent repression of ER α was largely reversed by trichostatin A, implicating histone deacetylase (HDAC) activity in this process (Fig. 2B). Collectively, these results reveal a function for BRCA1 as a repressor of ligand-independent, ER α -mediated transactivation.

To confirm these results in a biologically relevant cell type, we analyzed the ligand-independent activity of ER α in human ovarian adenocarcinoma BG-1 cells, which are ER α -positive and estrogen-dependent for growth (30). Previously, Annab *et al.* (22) described the generation of independent BG-1 clonal cell lines that support stably reduced BRCA1 mRNA and protein levels by retroviral-mediated BRCA1 antisense delivery. We tested the ability of ER α to direct ligand-independent transcription of the ERE-TK-Luc reporter gene after transfection into either a control retroviral vector-infected BG-1 clonal cell line (NEO1) or, alternatively, a BRCA1 antisense-infected BG-1 clonal cell line (AS4) exhibiting severely reduced BRCA1 expression levels (Fig. 3E; ref. 22). Consistent with the results obtained in MEF cells, ER α exhibited significantly increased ligand-independent activity in BRCA1-deficient AS4 cells compared with BRCA1-proficient NEO1 cells (Fig. 3A). We also observed a 2-fold reduction in the relative level of E2-mediated induction of reporter gene activity in AS4 cells compared with NEO1 cells, once again consistent with the results obtained in MEF cells (Fig. 3B). These results confirm that in a biologically relevant epithelial cell type, BRCA1 can mediate repression of ligand-independent ER α transactivation activity.

To determine whether the reduced BRCA1 expression levels in AS4 cells could be correlated with an increase in the ligand-independent expression of endogenous estrogen-responsive genes, we performed a direct comparative analysis of NEO1 and AS4 cells with respect to their ligand-independent expression of several estrogen-responsive genes. Individual monolayer cultures of NEO1 and AS4 cells were grown in the absence of estrogen for 5 days followed by the addition of either no hormone or, alternatively, E2 (10 $^{-7}$ M) for 1 h. Subsequently, cells were harvested and analyzed by semiquantitative RT-PCR




Fig. 3. Reduced BRCA1 expression in BG-1 human ovarian adenocarcinoma cells is accompanied by increases in estrogen-independent expression of estrogen-responsive genes. (A) Retroviral vector-infected (NEO1) and BRCA1 antisense-infected (AS4) BG-1 cell clones in estrogen-free media were transfected with pERE-TK-Luc without (–) or with (+) pRSV-ER α before assay for luciferase activity. (B) NEO1 and AS4 cells in estrogen-free media were transfected with pERE-TK-Luc with (+) pRSV-ER α in the absence (–) or presence (+) of E2 (10 $^{-7}$ M) before assay for luciferase activity. (C) NEO1 (lanes 1 and 3) or AS4 (lanes 2 and 4) cells in estrogen-free media were either untreated (lanes 1 and 2) or treated (lanes 3 and 4) with E2 (10 $^{-7}$ M) for 1 h. Cells were harvested and processed for semiquantitative RT-PCR analysis using primers specific for the estrogen-responsive cathepsin D (Cat D), pS2, and progesterone receptor genes, as well as the estrogen-nonresponsive ribosomal S16 gene. (D) NEO1 (lanes 1 and 3) or AS4 (lanes 2 and 4) cells (5 \times 10 6) in estrogen-free media were either untreated (lanes 1 and 2) or treated (lanes 3 and 4) with E2 (10 $^{-7}$ M) for 24 h. Culture medium was concentrated 10-fold by using a Centriprep YM-3 device, and 1/10th of the concentrate was resolved by SDS/15%PAGE and processed for immunoblot analysis using antibodies specific for pS2. Cells were also lysed in RIPA buffer, and 1/10th of the lysate was subjected to immunoblot analysis using antibodies specific for progesterone receptor β (PR), cathepsin D (Cat D), or nuclear matrix protein p84, which served as an internal loading control. (E) Whole cell lysates derived from NEO1 and AS4 cells were resolved by SDS/10%PAGE and processed for immunoblot analysis using antibodies specific for BRCA1, CtIP, and the p89 subunit of the transcription factor IIH (TFIIF), the latter two of which served as internal loading controls. The ER α -positive status of these cells was verified by using an ER α -specific rabbit polyclonal antibody. Densitometric quantitation of the immunoblot and normalization to the CtIP and TFIIF signals revealed BRCA1 expression to be reduced by 70% in AS4 cells compared with NEO1 cells.

for the expression levels of the endogenous estrogen-responsive pS2, cathepsin D, and progesterone receptor genes.

Relative to the expression level of an internal control ribosomal S16 gene, we observed increases in the ligand-independent expression levels of the pS2, cathepsin D, and progesterone receptor genes of 3-, 5-, and 9-fold, respectively, in BRCA1-deficient AS4 cells compared with BRCA1-proficient NEO1 cells (Fig. 3C). Interestingly, although the addition of E2 stimulated transcription of the pS2, cathepsin D, and the progesterone receptor genes in NEO1 cells, no such E2-dependent increase in the transcription of these genes could be observed in AS4 cells (Fig. 3C). Qualitatively similar results were observed at the protein level by immunoblot analysis. Relative to the level of an internal control protein (nuclear matrix protein p84), E2-independent increases in the steady-state levels of the pS2, cathepsin D, and progesterone receptor proteins could be observed in AS4 cells compared with NEO1 cells (Fig. 3D). Furthermore, although the addition of E2 elevated the steady-




Fig. 4. BRCA1 represses unliganded promoter-bound ERα-mediated transactivation. (A) Brca1+/+ and Brca1-/- MEFs were transfected with a pGAL4-SV40-Luc reporter plasmid either without (−) or with (+) a pGAL4-ERα expression plasmid before assay for luciferase activity. (B) Schematic diagram of the cathepsin D (Cat D) and pS2 gene regions targeted for ChIP analysis. Negative numbers refer to sequence coordinates that delineate PCR amplicons defined by gene-specific primer pairs relative to the transcription initiation site (right-angled arrow). Numbered nucleotides (nt) refer to the expected sizes of PCR-amplified products. MCF-7 cells, cultured in the absence of estrogen, were treated without (−E2) or with (+E2) E2 (10^{-7} M) for 1 h. Soluble chromatin was prepared and subjected to immunoprecipitation by using monoclonal antibodies specific for ERα (anti-ERα), BRCA1 (anti-BRCA1), or the RNA polymerase II large subunit (anti-pol II). Immunoprecipitated DNA was PCR-amplified by using primers that span the indicated regions of the cathepsin D and pS2 gene promoters. Input (1%) of the soluble chromatin subjected to immunoprecipitation was PCR-amplified directly by using each primer pair as indicated. (C) MCF-7 cells, cultured in the absence of estrogen, were treated without (−E2) or with (+E2) E2 (10^{-7} M) for 1 h before harvest and processing for semiquantitative RT-PCR analysis using primers specific for the estrogen-responsive cathepsin D (Cat D) and pS2 genes, as well as the estrogen-nonresponsive ribosomal S16 gene.

state level of each of these proteins in NEO1 cells, no such E2-dependent increase could be observed in AS4 cells (Fig. 3D). Quantitative differences between RT-PCR and immunoblot analyses could reflect the influence of posttranscriptional regulatory processes. Nonetheless, RT-PCR and immunoblot analyses both reveal that the ligand-independent expression of endogenous ERα-target genes is increased in BRCA1-deficient cells. Collectively, these results implicate BRCA1 in the ligand-independent repression of endogenous estrogen-responsive genes.

To explore the mechanism by which BRCA1 mediates ligand-independent repression of ERα, we first determined whether BRCA1 could interact with unliganded ERα *in vivo* by coimmunoprecipitation of the two proteins in human breast cancer MCF7 cells cultured in the absence of estrogen. Consistent with previous results (18), BRCA1 could be specifically coimmunoprecipitated with unliganded ERα, thus demonstrating that the two proteins can interact *in vivo* in a ligand-independent manner (data not shown).

To explore the possibility that BRCA1 represses the transactivation function of promoter-bound, unliganded ERα, we first tested the effect of BRCA1 on the ligand-independent transcriptional activity of ERα tethered to the yeast GAL4 DNA-binding domain by using a reporter template bearing GAL4 DNA-binding sites. This approach permitted us to assess the effect of BRCA1 on the transactivation function of unliganded ERα independent of any effects that BRCA1 might have on the DNA-binding activity of unliganded ERα. GAL4-ERα was cotransfected along with a GAL4-SV40-luciferase reporter template into Brca1-proficient and Brca1-deficient MEFs. We observed significant ligand-independent stimulation of reporter activity in Brca1-deficient, but not in Brca1-proficient, MEFs (Fig. 4A), suggesting one mechanism by which BRCA1 mediates ligand-independent repression of ERα is through direct repression of the DNA-bound receptor.

To confirm this observation under biologically relevant conditions *in vivo*, we used ChIP analyses to determine whether BRCA1 can be recruited directly to estrogen-responsive promoters in the absence of ligand. MCF-7 cells were grown in the absence of estrogen for 5 days followed by the addition of either no hormone or, alternatively, E2 (10^{-7} M) for 1 h. Promoter occupancy before and after E2 treatment at the estrogen response elements within the endogenous pS2 and cathepsin D gene promoters by ERα, BRCA1, and RNA polymerase II was

then monitored by ChIP using antibodies specific for each of the three proteins and semiquantitative PCR with primers flanking the estrogen response elements of the pS2 and cathepsin D promoters. In the absence of E2, ERα could be detected in association with both the pS2 and cathepsin D promoters, and this level was increased dramatically by the addition of E2 (Fig. 4B, lanes 2 and 6). Strikingly, we also observed pS2 and cathepsin D promoter occupancy by BRCA1 in the absence of E2, and a reduction in such occupancy after E2 treatment (Fig. 4B, lanes 3 and 7). By contrast, RNA polymerase II could be detected only following, but not before, E2 treatment, consistent with its ligand-dependent recruitment concomitant with transcriptional activation of the pS2 and cathepsin D genes (Fig. 4B, lanes 4 and 8 and C, lanes 1 and 2). The specificity of factor association within the estrogen-responsive region of the pS2 and cathepsin D promoters was confirmed by ChIP analysis using antibodies specific for ZBRK1, a sequence-specific DNA-binding transcriptional repressor that does not bind to pS2 or cathepsin D promoter sequences (14). ZBRK1-specific antibodies failed to immunoprecipitate pS2 and cathepsin D promoter sequences (data not shown). Further specificity of the ChIP assay was demonstrated by the inability to detect occupancy by ERα, BRCA1, or RNA polymerase II of a region \approx 3 kb upstream of the cathepsin D promoter (Fig. 4B). These results thus reveal the association of BRCA1 with unliganded ERα at endogenous estrogen-responsive promoters under physiologically relevant conditions *in vivo*.

Like other steroid receptors, ERα contains two transactivation domains, an N-terminal ligand-independent activation function (AF-1) that is targeted by a variety of steroid-independent cell-signaling pathways, and a C-terminal ligand-inducible activation function (AF-2) that resides within the receptor ligand-binding domain (31, 32). Previous analyses of ERα suggest a model whereby repressive factors binding to sequences within its C-terminal ligand-binding domain repress constitutively active AF-1 in the absence of an agonist or in the presence of an antagonist (26, 33). To determine whether ligand-independent repression of ERα by BRCA1 is mediated through the ERα ligand-binding domain, we tested the ligand-independent activity of a VP16-GAL4-ERα receptor chimera after its expression in both BRCA1-proficient and BRCA1-deficient BG-1 clonal cell lines. This chimera encodes ERα amino acids 251–595, including the hinge region and the ligand-binding domain, fused C-terminally to the hybrid transactivator VP16-GAL4 (26).




Fig. 5. VP16-GAL4-ER α exhibits hormone-dependent activity in BRCA1-proficient cells and constitutive activity in BRCA1-deficient cells. NEO1 (A and B) and AS4 (C) cells in estrogen-free media were transfected with a GAL4-E1B-Luc reporter plasmid along with (+) plasmids expressing either VP16-GAL4 or VP16-GAL4-ER α . Subsequently, transfected cells were either untreated (−) or treated (+) with E2 (10^{-7} M) before assay for luciferase activity.

Previously, deletion analysis of this receptor chimera revealed that constitutive VP16-GAL4-ER α activity could be recovered by the removal of sequences within the ligand-binding domain of the ER α moiety, thereby implicating the ER α ligand-binding domain in ligand-independent transcriptional repression of a neighboring constitutive activation domain (26). To determine whether this ligand-independent repression is mediated by BRCA1, we transfected the VP16-GAL4-ER α chimera along with a reporter template bearing GAL4 DNA binding sites into both BRCA1-proficient NEO1 cells and BRCA1-deficient AS4 cells. In NEO1 cells, the VP16-GAL4-ER α chimera exhibited minimal constitutive transactivation activity in the absence of E2; in response to E2, this level was dramatically increased to one approaching that of the potent VP16-GAL4 activator alone (Fig. 5 A and B). By contrast, in AS4 cells the VP16-GAL4-ER α chimera exhibited constitutive transactivation activity comparable to that exhibited by the VP16-GAL4 activator alone (Fig. 5C). The addition of E2 had a minimal effect on the elevated constitutive transactivation activity of the ER α chimera in AS4 cells (data not shown), suggesting that the principle effect of E2 is to override a ligand-independent barrier to the transactivation activity of the chimeric receptor. This barrier is present in NEO1 cells, but deficient in AS4 cells. Similar results were also observed by using isogenic Brcal-proficient and Brcal-deficient MEFs, eliminating the possibility that cell type-specific peculiarities contribute to the differential transactivation properties of the VP16-GAL4-ER α chimera in the presence and absence of BRCA1 (data not shown). Collectively, these results reveal the ER α ligand-binding domain to be a platform for the recruitment of BRCA1 from which the latter may confer ligand-independent repression on a linked activation domain. Hence, we conclude that BRCA1-mediated ligand-independent repression of ER α is likely to be mediated through the ER α ligand-binding domain.

Discussion

Recently, BRCA1 has been proposed to inhibit the ligand-dependent transcriptional activity of ER α through a direct interaction between the two proteins (18). Our current analysis of ER α transcriptional activity in Brcal-nullizygous MEFs revealed BRCA1 to be a ligand-reversible barrier to transcriptional activation by unliganded ER α . The biological relevance of this finding is further strengthened by the observation that BRCA1 also mediates ligand-independent repression of the ER α in human ovarian adenocarcinoma cells.

The underlying mechanism by which BRCA1 mediates ligand-independent repression of ER α transcriptional activity appears

to involve targeted recruitment by unliganded, promoter-bound ER α of a BRCA1-associated HDAC activity. This conclusion is based first on the observation that the HDAC inhibitor trichostatin A can effectively reverse ligand-independent repression mediated by BRCA1 and, second, on the results of ChIP analyses, which revealed the association of unliganded ER α with BRCA1 on endogenous estrogen-response elements *in vivo*. A likely target of BRCA1-mediated ligand-independent ER α repression is the constitutive AF-1 activation domain within ER α . Previous studies have indicated that antagonist-bound AF-2 can repress AF-1 activity through the recruitment of the nuclear corepressor N-CoR (33), whereas the ligand-binding domain of unliganded ER α can repress a linked heterologous activation domain in a ligand-reversible manner, presumably by the recruitment of a soluble corepressor (26). Our observation that an estrogen-dependent VP16-GAL4 chimeric transactivator carrying the ER α ligand-binding domain exhibits constitutive activity in BRCA1-deficient, but not in BRCA1-proficient BG-1 cells, reveals the ER α ligand-binding domain to be a potential site of BRCA1 recruitment for ligand-independent repression of a linked activation domain. Hence, BRCA1 could be recruited to the ER α ligand-binding domain as part of a larger repression complex to silence AF-1 function in the absence of ligand. The recent report of a direct interaction between BRCA1 and the ER α ligand-binding domain (18) lends additional support to this model.

Should BRCA1 function to inhibit the ligand-dependent transcriptional activity of ER α (17, 18), it seems unlikely to do so through a mechanism that involves promoter-bound ER α . Our ChIP analysis revealed the association of BRCA1 with ER α at endogenous estrogen-response elements before, but not after, estrogen stimulation. Thus, we favor a model in which BRCA1, along with an associated corepressor(s) that minimally includes an HDAC activity, is recruited by unliganded, promoter-bound ER α to effectively silence the constitutive AF-1 activation domain and thereby repress estrogen-responsive target gene transcription. After estrogen stimulation, a ligand-induced conformational change within ER α could lead to enhanced affinity of the ER α for its cognate binding site and release of a BRCA1-containing repression complex, thereby liberating AF-1 and AF-2 to synergistically recruit coactivators and the RNA polymerase II holoenzyme to promote transcription (29). It is also possible that BRCA1 could function additionally as a barrier to the productive association of either unliganded and/or liganded ER α with promoter DNA, and this could underlie the previous observation that BRCA1 can inhibit ligand-dependent ER α transactivation (17, 18).

Interestingly, we observed that a deficiency of BRCA1 also leads to a reduction in the relative level of E2-mediated ER α activation. In both Brcal-nullizygous MEFs and BRCA1-deficient BG-1 (AS4) cells, the relative level of E2-mediated activation of a transfected ER α -responsive reporter gene was diminished when compared with Brcal-proficient cells. Furthermore, in AS4 cells, the endogenous estrogen-response genes that we monitored exhibited increased estrogen-independent expression and little or no estrogen-dependent stimulation when compared with BRCA1-proficient BG-1 (NEO1) cells. It is possible that the expression of these genes is largely derepressed in a BRCA1-deficient background and cannot therefore be increased substantially in response to estrogen.

Previously, Annab *et al.* (22) demonstrated that relative to parental or retroviral vector-infected BG-1 cell clones, BRCA1 antisense-infected BG-1 cell clones exhibit enhanced estrogen-independent growth in culture (22). Furthermore, BG-1 clone AS4, which exhibits severely reduced BRCA1 expression levels, exhibited increased tumorigenicity in ovariectomized nude mice compared with the retroviral vector-infected NEO1 cell clone (22). These observations suggest that forced reduction of

BRCA1 in BG-1 ovarian adenocarcinoma cells may influence estrogen-independent growth both *in vitro* and *in vivo*. Our observation that AS4 cells support significant increases in the estrogen-independent expression levels of different ER α -target genes compared with BRCA1-proficient NEO1 cells may provide a mechanistic basis for the estrogen-independent growth advantages that AS4 cells exhibit.

The finding that BRCA1 can function as a ligand-reversible barrier to transcriptional activation by unliganded ER α suggests the potential involvement of BRCA1 in the proliferative control of normal estrogen-regulated tissues. Thus, mutational inactivation of BRCA1 could result in persistent expression of estrogen-responsive genes in the absence of threshold levels of estrogenic stimulation. In this way, inappropriate hormonal responses brought about by BRCA1 mutation might possibly promote the proliferation of transformation-initiated cells.

Previous analyses have revealed that a significant proportion of BRCA1-associated breast tumors are negative for ER α expression (34). However, the loss of ER α expression in BRCA1-associated tumors is likely to represent a relatively late

event in breast tumor progression, one that may have occurred after any proliferative advantages conferred upon transformation-initiated cells by homozygous BRCA1 mutation have ensued. Possibly, the down-regulation of ER α expression in BRCA1-mutated tumors could derive in part from negative feedback control enlisted by BRCA1-mutated breast epithelial cells to restrict the promiscuous expression of estrogen-responsive genes. Future studies should illuminate the mechanistic basis for BRCA1-mediated transcriptional repression of ER α and clarify its functional role in the larger network of hormone signaling pathways that control the growth, differentiation, and homeostasis of breast and ovary.

We thank D. Jones and P. Garza for technical assistance, Drs. M. J. Tsai and B. W. O'Malley for the receptor expression and reporter plasmids, Dr. J. H. White for the GAL4-VP16-ER α expression plasmid, and Dr. P.-L. Chen, Dr. P. R. Yew, and W. Tan for advice and comments. This work was supported by National Institutes of Health Grants P01CA30195 and P01CA81020, the McDermott Endowment Fund, and a San Antonio Cancer Institute Pilot Project Grant.

1. Martin, A. M. & Weber, B. L. (2000) *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.* **92**, 1126–1135.
2. Tirkkonen, M., Johannsson, O., Agnarsson, B. A., Olsson, H., Ingvarsson, S., Karhu, R., Tanner, M., Isola, J., Barkardottir, R. B., Borg, A. & Kallioniemi, O. (1997) *Cancer Res.* **57**, 1222–1227.
3. Tomlinson, G. E., Chen, T. T., Stastny, V. A., Virmani, A. K., Spillman, M. A., Tonk, V., Blum, J. L., Schneider, N. R., Wistuba, I. I., Shay, J. W., et al. (1998) *Cancer Res.* **58**, 3237–3243.
4. Xu, X., Weaver, Z., Linke, S. P., Li, C., Gotay, J., Wang, X. W., Harris, C. C., Ried, T., Deng, C. X. (1999) *Mol. Cell* **3**, 389–395.
5. Zheng, L., Li, S., Boyer, T. G. & Lee, W.-H. (2000) *Oncogene* **19**, 6159–6175.
6. Welsch, P. L., Owens, K. N. & King, M. C. (2000) *Trends Genet.* **16**, 69–74.
7. Gowen, L. C., Avrutskaya, A. V., Latour, A. M., Koller, B. H. & Leadon, S. A. (1998) *Science* **281**, 1009–1012.
8. Moynahan, M. E., Chiu, J. W., Koller, B. H. & Jasin, M. (1999) *Mol. Cell* **4**, 511–518.
9. Zhong, Q., Chen, C. F., Li, S., Chen, Y., Wang, C.-C., Xiao, J., Chen, P.-L., Sharp, Z. D. & Lee, W.-H. (1999) *Science* **285**, 747–750.
10. Harkin, D. P., Bean, J. M., Miklos, D., Song, Y.-H., Truong, V. B., Englert, C., Christians, F. C., Ellisen, L. W., Maheswaran, S., Oliner, J. D. & Haber, D. A. (1999) *Cell* **97**, 575–586.
11. Hollander, M. C., Sheikh, M. S., Bulavin, D. V., Lundgren, K., Auger-Henmueller, L., Shehee, R., Molinaro, T. A., Kim, K. E., Tolosa, E., Ashwell, J. D., et al. (1999) *Nat. Genet.* **23**, 176–184.
12. Somasundaram, K., Zhang, H., Zeng, Y. X., Houvras, H., Peng, Y., Zhang, H., Wu, G. S., Licht, J. D., Weber, B. L. & El-Deiry, W. S. (1997) *Nature (London)* **389**, 187–190.
13. Wang, X. W., Zhan, Q., Courses, J. D., Khan, M. A., Kontny, U., Yu, L., Hollander, M. C., O'Conner, P. M., Fornace, A. J., Jr., & Harris, C. (1999) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **96**, 3706–3711.
14. Zheng, L., Pan, H., Li, S., Fleskin-Nikitin, A., Chen, P.-L., Boyer, T. G. & Lee, W.-H. (2000) *Mol. Cell* **6**, 757–768.
15. Hilakivi-Clarke, L. (2000) *Cancer Res.* **60**, 4993–5001.
16. Liehr, J. G. (2000) *Endocr. Rev.* **21**, 40–54.
17. Fan, S., Wang, J.-A., Yuan, R., Meng, Q., Yuan, R.-Q., Ma, Y. X., Erdos, M. R., Pestell, R. G., Yuan, F., Auborn, K. J., et al. (1999) *Science* **284**, 1354–1356.
18. Fan, S., Yong, X., Wang, C., Yuan, R.-Q., Meng, Q., Wang, J.-A., Erdos, M., Goldberg, I. D., Webb, P., Kushner, P. J., et al. (2001) *Oncogene* **20**, 77–87.
19. Yeh, S., Hu, Y.-C., Rahman, M., Lin, H.-K., Hsu, C.-L., Ting, H.-J., Kang, H.-Y. & Chang, C. (2000) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **97**, 11256–11261. (First Published October 3, 2000; 10.1073/pnas.19053897)
20. Park, J. J., Irvine, R. A., Buchanan, G., Koh, S. S., Park, J. M., Tilley, W. D., Stallcup, M. R., Press, M. F. & Coetzee, G. A. (2000) *Cancer Res.* **60**, 5946–5949.
21. Rebbeck, T. R., Kantoff, P. W., Krishivas, K., Neuhausen, S., Blackwood, M. A., Godwin, A. K., Daly, M. B., Narod, S. A., Garber, J. E., Lynch, H. T., et al. (1999) *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **64**, 1371–1377.
22. Annab, L. A., Hawkins, R. E., Solomon, G., Barrett, J. C. & Afshari, C. A. (2000) *Breast Cancer Res.* **2**, 139–148.
23. Leng, X., Blanco, J., Tsai, S. Y., Ozato, K., O'Malley, B. W. & Tsai, M. J. (1994) *J. Biol. Chem.* **269**, 31436–31442.
24. Hsu, H.-L., Wadman, I. & Baer, R. (1994) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **91**, 3181–3185.
25. Sadowski, I., Bell, B., Broad, P. & Hollis, M. (1992) *Gene* **118**, 137–141.
26. Lee, H. S., Aumais, J. & White, J. H. (1996) *J. Biol. Chem.* **271**, 25727–25730.
27. Tong, D., Schneberger, C., Leodolter, S. & Zeilinger, R. (1997) *Anal. Biochem.* **251**, 173–177.
28. Liu, Z., Brattain, M. G. & Appert, H. (1997) *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* **231**, 283–289.
29. Shang, Y., Hu, X., DiRenzo, J., Lazar, M. A. & Brown, M. (2000) *Cell* **103**, 843–852.
30. Geisinger, K. R., Kute, T. E., Pettenati, M. J., Welander, C. E., Dennard, Y., Collins, L. A. & Berens, M. E. (1989) *Cancer* **63**, 280–288.
31. Weigel, N. & Zhang, Y. (1998) *J. Mol. Med.* **76**, 469–479.
32. Klinge, C. M. (2000) *Steroids* **65**, 227–251.
33. Lavinsky, R. M., Jepsen, K., Heinzel, T., Torchia, J., Mullen, T. M., Schiff, R., Del-Rio, A. L., Ricote, M., Ngo, S., Gemsch, J., et al. (1998) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **95**, 2920–2925.
34. Loman, N., Johannsson, O., Bendahl, P. O., Borg, A., Ferno, M. & Olsson, H. (1998) *Cancer* **83**, 310–319.

Deficient Nonhomologous End-Joining Activity in Cell-free Extracts from Brcal-null Fibroblasts¹

Qing Zhong, Thomas G. Boyer, Phang-Lang Chen, and Wen-Hwa Lee²

Department of Molecular Medicine/Institute of Biotechnology, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, San Antonio, Texas 78245

ABSTRACT

BRCA1 ensures genomic stability, at least in part, through a functional role in DNA damage repair. BRCA1 interacts with the Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1 complex that occupies a central role in DNA double-strand break repair mediated by homologous recombination and nonhomologous end joining (NHEJ). NHEJ can be catalyzed by mammalian whole cell extract in a reaction dependent upon DNA ligase IV, Xrcc4, Ku70, Ku80, and DNA-PKcs. Here, we show that under identical cell-free reaction conditions, the addition of antibodies specific for BRCA1 and Rad 50 but not Rad51, inhibits end-joining activity. Cell extracts derived from Brcal-deficient mouse embryonic fibroblasts exhibit reduced end-joining activity independent of the endogenous protein amounts of DNA ligase IV, Ku80, and Ku70. The Brcal-dependent NHEJ activity predominates at the lower concentrations of Mg²⁺ (0.5 mM); elevated Mg²⁺ or Mn²⁺ concentrations (10 mM) dramatically increase overall end-joining activity and abrogates the requirement for Brcal, Xrcc4, and Ku70. The addition of partially purified BRCA1, in association with Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1 complex, complements the NHEJ deficiency of Brcal-null fibroblast extracts. These results suggest a role for Brcal in NHEJ and in the maintenance of genome integrity.

INTRODUCTION

Inactivation of the hereditary breast cancer susceptibility gene, *BRCA1*,³ leads to genomic instability (1–3). Extensive chromosomal abnormalities have been observed in Brcal-deficient murine fibroblasts (4), as well as the BRCA1-mutant human breast cancer cell line HCC1937 (5). The function of BRCA1 in genome stability is attributable to its central role in the cellular response to DNA damage response, and emerging evidence supports a role for BRCA1 in DNA damage repair. For example, Brcal-deficient murine and human cells are sensitive to DNA-damaging agents, including IR (6–8). Furthermore, HCC1937 cells expressing mutant BRCA1 protein exhibit a reduction in both the rate and extent of DSB repair after IR when compared with cells expressing wild-type BRCA1 protein (9). Finally, BRCA1 physically interacts with the Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1 DSB repair complex and colocalizes to nuclear foci along with this complex after treatment of cells with IR (8).

In eukaryotic cells, DSBs are repaired through two distinct pathways: homologous recombination and NHEJ. BRCA1 has been implicated in homology-based repair because cells expressing a Brcal exon-11 deletion mutant exhibit defects in gene targeting, single-strand annealing, and gene conversion (10). BRCA1 may also influence NHEJ by virtue of its interaction with the Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1 complex. The orthologous complex in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* Rad50/Mre11/Xrs2 is critical for NHEJ, sister chromatid recombination, and telomere maintenance. Yeast

strains deficient in any of the components of the Rad50/Mre11/Xrs2 complex are 10–100-fold less efficient in nonhomologous joining of DNA ends (11, 12). The Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1 complex is characterized by 3' to 5' exonuclease activity on double-stranded DNA and endonuclease activity on single-stranded DNA and hairpin structures. Furthermore, in the presence of a DNA ligase, Mre11 can facilitate DNA end joining using microhomologies at or near DNA termini (13, 14). Recently, the yeast Rad50/Mre11/Xrs2 complex was found to exhibit DNA end-binding activity and end-bridging activity (15). Thus, the Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1 complex may fulfill a functionally conserved role in NHEJ.

In mammalian cells, a NHEJ pathway has been identified that comprises the heterodimeric DNA end-binding activity Ku70/Ku80 and the DNA-PKcs (reviewed in Ref. 12). Recently, Baumann *et al.* (16) developed a cell-free system that faithfully reflects the genetic requirements for this NHEJ pathway. In this system, accurate intermolecular ligation of DNA ends was found to be dependent on DNA ligase IV/Xrcc4 and requires Ku70, Ku80, and DNA-PKcs. However, the role of Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1 in this NHEJ assay has not been addressed.

We report here the use of this cell-free assay to investigate the role of BRCA1 in DNA end joining. We observed that antibodies specific for BRCA1, Rad50, and Ku70, but not Rad51, inhibit the end-joining activity present in extracts prepared from a human lymphoblastoid cell line. Comparison of extracts derived from Brcal-null MEFs with that from isogenic Brcal-proficient MEFs for their respective abilities to catalyze end joining *in vitro* revealed that Brcal-deficient MEF extracts exhibit a significantly reduced end-joining activity. This deficiency can be complemented by partially purified BRCA1 in association with the Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1 complex. Finally, we found the BRCA1-dependent NHEJ activity in mammalian WCE to be sensitive to the reaction concentration of divalent cations. Elevated concentrations of Mg²⁺ or Mn²⁺ (to 10 mM) stimulated the overall level of DNA end-joining activity and masked a BRCA1, Ku, and Xrcc4 requirement. These results provide evidence that BRCA1 promote NHEJ in a Mg²⁺ concentration-dependent manner.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

MEFs and Lymphoblastoid Cell Line. The *Brcal*^{−/−}; *p53*^{−/−} and *p53*^{+/−} MEFs were derived from 9.5-day old embryos of a cross between *Brcal*^{+/−} and *p53*^{+/−} mice as described (17) and cultured in DMEM plus 10% FCS. Human lymphoblastoid cell line, LEM, was immortalized by Epstein-Barr virus and cultured in DMEM plus 10% FCS.

Cell-free NHEJ Assay. Cell extracts were prepared and *in vitro* reactions were performed according to previously described procedure (16). WCEs were normalized for their respective total protein levels using the Bio-Rad protein assay (Bio-Rad, Richmond, CA). Reactions (16 μl) were carried out in 50 mM triethanolamine-HCl (pH 7.5), 0.5 mM Mg(OAc)₂, 80 mM potassium acetate, 2 mM ATP, 1 mM DTT, and 100 μg/ml BSA. Cell-free extracts were incubated for 5 min at 37°C before the addition of 5 fmol ³²P-labeled DNA. pBSK(+) duplex plasmid DNA (2.96 kb; Stratagene, La Jolla, CA) was linearized with EcoRI, dephosphorylated using calf intestinal phosphatase, and was 5' ³²P-end-labeled using polynucleotide kinase. In each reaction, 5 fmol of labeled DNA was used. After incubation at 37°C for 1 h, ³²P-labeled DNA products were deproteinized by proteinase K (500 μg/ml) and 1% SDS at 37°C for 20 min and analyzed by electrophoresis through 0.7% agarose gels, followed by autoradiography. Quantitation of DNA end-joining efficiency was carried out

Received 3/12/02; accepted 5/13/02.

The costs of publication of this article were defrayed in part by the payment of page charges. This article must therefore be hereby marked *advertisement* in accordance with 18 U.S.C. Section 1734 solely to indicate this fact.

¹ Supported in part by NIH Grant CA 81020 and 94170 (to W-H. L.) and Grant CA 85605 (to P-L. C.). Q. Z. was supported by a predoctoral training grant from the U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command under DAMD17-99-1-9402.

² To whom requests for reprints should be addressed, at E-mail: leew@uthscsa.edu.

³ The abbreviations used are: *BRCA1*, human breast cancer 1 gene; BRCA1, protein product of *BRCA1*; *Brcal*, mouse breast cancer 1 gene; Brcal, protein product of *Brcal*; IR, ionizing radiation; NHEJ, nonhomologous end joining; DSB, double-strand break; MEF, mouse embryonic fibroblast; WCE, whole cell extract; mAb, monoclonal antibody; RPBI, RNA polymerase II.

by densitometry. For antibody inhibition experiments, cell extracts were preincubated with specific antibodies on ice for 30 min before shifting to 37°C for 5 min, followed by the addition of 32 P-labeled DNA.

Antibodies and Antisera. A recombinant protein containing glutathione S-transferase fused with mouse *Brcal* of amino acids 788-1135 in frame was used as an antigen for the production of antimurine *Brcal* mouse polyclonal antisera. Purified goat IgG specific for XRCC4, Ku70, and Ku80 was purchased from Santa Cruz Biotechnology (Santa Cruz, CA). Purified mouse monoclonal antibody specific for BRCA1 (Ab-1) was purchased from OncoGene Research Products (San Diego, CA). Other antibodies specifically against BRCA1, Rad50, and Rad51 have been described (8).

The amounts of the following antibodies were used in NHEJ inhibition experiments: 10 μ g of antimouse IgG; 1 μ g of purified goat anti-Ku70 IgG; 1 μ g of anti-BRCA1 mAb Ab-1; 2 μ g of anti-BRCA1 mAb 17F8; 5 μ g of anti-Rad50 mAb 13B3; 1 μ g of purified rabbit anti-Rad51 IgG; and 1 μ g of purified rabbit anti-Xrcc4. Only mAbs and commercial available purified antisera were used in antibody inhibition assays. Most of the polyclonal antisera contain high levels of nuclease activity and cannot be used in the cell-free end-joining assay.

Protein Purification. HeLa cell nuclear extract was subjected to successive phosphocellulose P-11, DEAE-Sepharose, and Superose 6 gel filtration chromatography as described previously (18). Individual fractions derived from Superose 6 chromatography corresponding to the peaks of the Rad50, Mre11, and NBS1 proteins were pooled and designated as fraction C1. The fraction C1 was concentrated on phosphocellulose P-11 by elution with 0.5 M KCl D buffer [20 mM HEPES (pH 7.9), 0.2 mM EDTA, and 20% glycerol], followed by dialysis with 0.1 M KCl in D buffer.

RESULTS

To explore the function of BRCA1 in DNA repair, we used an *in vitro* DNA end-joining assay that has been described previously (16). In this system, NHEJ catalyzed by human WCE was observed by rejoining 32 P-labeled linear duplex DNA in a reaction that is dependent upon all of the mammalian factors thus far genetically implicated in NHEJ, including DNA ligase IV, Xrcc4, Ku70, Ku80, and DNA-PKcs. We initially tested WCE from a human lymphoblastoid cell line, LEM, for its ability to catalyze NHEJ and observed that 25-35% of the input DNA molecules were rejoined during a 1-h incubation with 20 μ g of this cell extract. Under identical reaction conditions, BRCA1-specific antibodies Ab-1 and 17F8, preincubated with LEM WCE before the addition of 32 P-end-labeled linear DNA into the reaction, dramatically inhibited end joining (Fig. 1). Antibodies specific for Rad50 also inhibited the end-joining activity present in WCE. Consistent with previous observations, antibodies specific for Ku70




Fig. 2. Deficient end-joining activity in *Brcal* mutant MEFs. *A*, end-joining activity of MEF extracts. Increasing amounts of WCE from each of the indicated MEF cell lines were incubated with 32 P-end-labeled linear DNA and assayed for end-joining activity. *B*, quantitative analysis by phosphorimaging. End-joining efficiency was calculated as: intensity of end-joining products/total substrate $\times 100\%$; error bars indicate the experimental deviation. *C*, immunoblot analysis demonstrating equivalent levels of representative NHEJ proteins and an unrelated nuclear matrix protein, p84, in the MEF WCEs assayed for end-joining activity.

inhibited end-joining activity *in vitro* (16). However, antibodies specific for Rad51 or normal murine IgG did not inhibit end-joining activity. These results indicate that BRCA1 and Rad50, but not Rad51, may be involved in NHEJ in this cell-free system.

To further substantiate the requirement for BRCA1 in NHEJ, we directly compared WCEs derived from *Brcal*^{-/-}*p53*^{-/-} MEFs with extracts from both *p53*^{-/-} and wild-type MEFs for their respective NHEJ activities *in vitro*. WCEs from wild-type or *p53*^{-/-} MEFs could rejoin 35-50% of input DNA. Significantly, WCE from *Brcal*^{-/-}*p53*^{-/-} MEFs was reduced 3-10-fold consistently, relative to WCE from either *p53*^{-/-} or wild-type MEFs, for end-joining activity (Fig. 2, *A* and *B*). For quantitative standardization, WCEs




Fig. 1. Antibodies specific for BRCA1, Rad50, and Ku70 inhibit the end-joining activity present in human cell extract. Human lymphoblastoid LEM WCE was preincubated with BRCA1-specific antibodies Ab-1 (Lanes 9-11) and 17F8 (Lanes 12-14), Ku70-specific antibody (Lanes 6-8), Rad50-specific antibody (Lanes 15-17), Rad51-specific antibody (Lanes 18-20), or control antibody murine IgG (Lanes 3-5) before the addition of 32 P-end-labeled linear DNA (5 fmol/reaction) and subsequent incubation. Antibodies or antisera were added at 1:6 serial dilutions as follows (the actual amounts were described in the "Materials and Methods" section): straight (Lanes 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, and 20); diluted 1/6, (Lanes 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, and 19); diluted 1/36, (Lanes 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, and 18). *Lane 1*: no extract. *Lane 2*: LEM extract alone. Note that BRCA1-, Rad50-, and Ku-70-specific, but not control, antibodies inhibited end joining. The end-joining efficiency was calculated as the end-joining activity [intensity of multimers/(multimers/monomer)] in each reaction expressed relative to the end-joining activity in WCEs without antibodies as determined by densitometric analysis.

were first normalized for total protein levels and subsequently analyzed by immunoblot analyses for their respective expression levels of Ku70, Ku80, DNA ligase IV, Rad50, Mre11, or the nuclear matrix protein p84 (19). No significant difference in protein levels could be observed among these WCEs (Fig. 2C), excluding the possibility that the reduced end-joining activity in Brca1-null cell extract is because of variations in the expression levels of these NHEJ proteins.

It is known that divalent cations such as Mg²⁺ and Mn²⁺ affect NHEJ catalyzed by mammalian WCE *in vitro* (20). Our NHEJ reactions included 0.5 mM Mg²⁺ and were performed identically to those described initially by Baumann *et al.* (16). To test whether the Brca1-dependent NHEJ activity present in WCEs of MEFs is affected by the concentration of divalent ions, we compared extracts derived from Brca1-deficient and wild-type MEFs for their respective NHEJ activities in the presence of increasing concentrations of Mg²⁺ or Mn²⁺. As shown in Fig. 3, augmentation of the Mg²⁺ or Mn²⁺ concentration dramatically increased the level of DNA end joining catalyzed by both Brca1-null and wild-type cell extracts and concomitantly abrogated the requirement for Brca1 regardless the amount of WCE used in the reactions. Thus, at reaction concentrations of divalent ions exceeding 1.5 mM Mg²⁺ or 0.5 mM Mn²⁺ plus 0.5 mM Mg²⁺, the difference in NHEJ catalyzed by Brca1-null and wild-type MEF extracts was indistinguishable, possibly

indicating the involvement of a Brca1-independent pathway for NHEJ under these conditions.

To explore the relationship between the Brca1-dependent NHEJ activity and known components of the NHEJ pathway, including Xrcc4 and Ku70, at different divalent ion concentrations, we performed reactions with either 0.5 mM or 10 mM Mg²⁺ (Fig. 4). Addition of Brca1-specific antibody reduced end-joining activity in Brca1 proficient MEFs to the level of Brca1 mutant cells at 0.5 mM Mg²⁺. Similarly, the addition of antibodies against Ku70 and Xrcc4 completely eliminated end-joining activity of Brca1 deficient or proficient cells. These observations suggest that BRCA1 may function along with Xrcc4 and Ku70 in NHEJ. However, at 10 mM Mg²⁺, the additions of antibodies against Ku70, Xrcc4, and BRCA1 have no apparent inhibitory function against the robust end-joining activities in both Brca1-proficient and -deficient MEFs (Fig. 4), indicating an existence of an alternative pathway.

To determine whether a cellular fraction containing BRCA1 can complement the diminished NHEJ activity in Brca1-deficient cells, we fractionated human HeLa cell nuclear extract according to the scheme outlined in Fig. 5A. The bulk of BRCA1 protein present in a soluble HeLa nuclear extract bound to phosphocellulose PC-11 and eluted predominantly and approximately equally between 0.1–0.3 and 0.3–0.5 M KCl step fractions (fractions B and C, respectively, Fig. 5A). The bulk of cellular Rad50 protein was also recovered in the PC-11 B and C fractions, although more eluted in the B fraction than in the C fraction (Fig. 5A). Most of the BRCA1 protein present in the PC-11 C fraction bound to, and eluted from, a DEAE-Sepharose anion exchange resin in a 0.1–0.25 M KCl step fraction (fraction CB). After Superose 6 gel filtration chromatography of the CB fraction, BRCA1 was eluted in fractions corresponding to peaks of the Rad50, Mre11, and Nbs1 proteins, indicating cofractionation of BRCA1 with the Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1 protein complex (Fig. 5A). Western blot analysis of individual Superose 6 column fractions with antibodies specific for BRCA1 and the large subunit of RPB1 also revealed that the bulk of BRCA1 eluted ahead of RPB1 in a number of high molecular weight fractions (Fig. 5A). Reciprocal coimmunoprecipitation of BRCA1 and Rad50 from peak Superose 6 column fractions demonstrated that BRCA1, Rad50, and Nbs1 all reside in a single high molecular weight complex of $M_r \sim 1,000,000$ (Fig. 5B).

Individual Superose 6 column fractions corresponding to the peak of the BRCA1/Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1 complex were pooled and concentrated on phosphocellulose PC-11 to yield a partially purified protein fraction termed C1. Fraction C1 was tested for its ability to complement WCE of Brca1-deficient MEF for end-joining activity *in vitro*. Although it catalyzed no end-joining activity on its own, the addition of fraction C1 to WCE of Brca1-deficient MEFs increased its end-joining activity about 2.5-fold (Fig. 5, C and D) to 60% of the end-joining activity catalyzed by WCE derived from Brca1-proficient MEFs. The addition of fraction C1 to WCE of Brca1-proficient MEFs has no effect on end-joining activity (data not shown). These results suggest that the partially purified BRCA1 complex facilitated the BRCA1-dependent NHEJ process.

DISCUSSION

BRCA1 plays an important role in maintaining genomic stability through its participation in DNA repair and cell cycle checkpoint control. For DNA DSB repair, BRCA1 has been shown to be critical for homologous recombination (10). However, it is not known whether BRCA1 has a role in NHEJ. In this study, we showed that under identical cell-free reaction conditions described by Baumann *et al.* (16), the addition of antibodies specific for BRCA1 and Rad50, but not Rad51, inhibits end-joining activity. Cell extracts derived from Brca1-deficient MEFs exhibit reduced end-joining activity independent of the endogenous protein amounts of DNA ligase IV, Ku80, and Ku70. The BRCA1-dependent NHEJ activity predominates at the lower concentra-




Fig. 3. DNA end-joining activity in cell extracts is sensitive to Mg²⁺ and Mn²⁺. *A*, determination of optimal concentration of Mg²⁺. Cell extracts (10 µg) derived from Brca1-proficient (odd-numbered lanes) or Brca1-deficient (even-numbered lanes) MEFs were incubated with different concentration of Mg²⁺ as follows: Lanes 1–2, 0.125 mM; Lanes 3–4, 0.5 mM; Lanes 5–6, 1 mM; Lanes 7–8, 5 mM; and Lanes 9–10, 10 mM. *B*, determination of the effect of Mn²⁺. Extract (10 µg) derived from Brca1-proficient (odd-numbered lanes) or Brca1-deficient (even-numbered lanes) MEFs were incubated at 0.5 mM Mg²⁺ with different concentration of Mn²⁺ as follows: Lanes 1–2, 0 mM; Lanes 3–4, 0.5 mM; Lanes 5–6, 1 mM; Lanes 7–8, 2 mM; and Lanes 9–10, 4 mM. *C*, titration of the amount of cell extracts. In the presence of 10 mM Mg²⁺, cell extracts (2.5, 5, 10, and 20 µg) derived from Brca1-proficient (odd-numbered lanes) or Brca1-deficient (even-numbered lanes) MEFs were assayed for DNA end-joining activity.




Fig. 4. Antibodies specific against BRCA1, Ku, and Xrcc4 inhibit NHEJ at 0.5 mM, but not at 10 mM, Mg²⁺. At 0.5 mM Mg²⁺ (odd lanes), antibodies against BRCA1 (Lanes 1 and 9) to the level of Brca1-deficient cells (Lanes 3 and 11). Antibodies against Xrcc4 (Lane 5–8) or Ku70 (Lanes 13–16) completely inhibited the end-joining activity in Brca1-proficient cells (Lanes 5 and 13) and the residual activity in Brca1-deficient cells (Lanes 7 and 15). However, at 10 mM Mg²⁺ (even lanes), robust end-joining activity in both Brca1-proficient and Brca1-deficient MEFs is resistant to antibodies against Ku70 (Lanes 6 and 8), Xrcc4 (Lanes 14 and 16), and BRCA1 (Lanes 10 and 12), indicating an existence of an alternative pathway.

tions of 0.5 mM Mg²⁺; elevated reaction concentrations of Mg²⁺ or Mn²⁺ to 10 mM dramatically increases overall end-joining activity and abrogates the requirement for Brca1, Xrcc4, and Ku70. The addition of partially purified BRCA1 in association with Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1 complements the NHEJ deficiency of Brca1-deficient MEF extracts. These results support a role for BRCA1 in NHEJ.

BRCA1 is likely to participate in NHEJ by virtue of its interaction with the Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1 complex. Previous work has demonstrated that BRCA1 interacts physically with the Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1 complex *in vivo* and *in vitro* (8). Furthermore, BRCA1 can be isolated from cells in a high molecular complex with Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1. These observations suggest that the function of BRCA1 in DSB repair may be mediated, at least in part, through its association with the Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1 complex. It is recently shown that the yeast counterpart Rad50/Mre11/Xrs2 has DNA end-binding and bridging activities. Addition of the Ku homologous protein HdfA and B enhances the DNA end-bridging activity of the Rad50/Mre11/Xrs2 complex. The Rad50/Mre11/Xrs2 complex then directly recruits Dnl4/Lif1 (equivalent to mammalian DNA ligase IV and Xrcc4) to complete DNA end ligation (15). Similarly, mammalian Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1 has also been shown to exhibit DNA end-tethering activity (21, 22). Therefore, NHEJ *in vitro* can be carried out by components, including Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1, Ku homologues, and DNA ligase IV/Xrcc4. Although the precise role of BRCA1 in NHEJ remains unclear, the ability of BRCA1 to form a tight complex with Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1 suggests that BRCA1 may facilitate the NHEJ function of this complex. Recently, a purified recombinant BRCA1 was shown to have a direct DNA-binding activity (23). Whether this DNA-binding activity has a direct contribution to the NHEJ warrants additional investigation.

The cell-free system for NHEJ that we used in this study has been reported to be dependent on a DNA-PK-mediated pathway (16). Nonetheless, substantial evidence accumulated from *in vitro* studies indicates that eukaryotic cells rely on more than one DNA end-joining pathway (24–27). For example, extracts derived from the DNA-PK mutant cell line MO59J have been reported to exhibit wild-type end-joining activity, suggesting the involvement of a DNA-PK-independent end-joining pathway in these cells (27). The relative contribution of a particular pathway to the overall end-joining activity observed in mammalian WCEs likely




Fig. 5. Complementation of NHEJ activity in BRCA1-deficient cell extracts by exogenous BRCA1. A, schematic diagram of purification of a BRCA1/Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1-containing complex. HeLa cell nuclear extract (NEXT) was subjected to successive phosphocellulose PC-11, DEAE-Sepharose, and Superose 6 gel filtration chromatography. CB protein fraction (4 mg/ml) was subjected to Superose 6 column fractions. Individual fractions were resolved by 10% SDS-PAGE and subjected to immunoblot analysis using antibodies specific for the proteins indicated to the left of the blot (mIgG = murine IgG). Immunoprecipitates were resolved by 10% SDS-PAGE and subjected to immunoblot analysis with antibodies specific for the proteins indicated to the left of the blot. B, coimmunoprecipitation of Brca1-deficient MEF extracts for end-joining activity by a BRCA1/Rad50/Mre11/Nbs1 complex. Fraction C1 was added as indicated to Brca1-deficient WCE and incubated on ice for 30 min before assay of end-joining activity. Fraction C1 alone (Lane 8) does not catalyze end-joining activity. D, end-joining activity in C was measured as [intensity of multimers (multimers + monomer) × 100%] by phosphoimage analysis and converted to percentage of joined DNA molecules.

reflects the *in vitro* reaction conditions used. One factor that could alter the relative influence of a particular end-joining pathway in the reaction is the concentration of divalent cations, particularly Mg²⁺ and Mn²⁺. In this regard, we observed that the BRCA1-dependent NHEJ activity present in mammalian WCE is sensitive to the reaction concentration of Mg²⁺ and Mn²⁺. Elevated concentrations of these divalent cations stimulates overall end-joining activity and masks the requirement for BRCA1, suggesting the involvement of a BRCA1-independent pathway to achieve end joining. A similar phenomenon has recently been reported for DNA ligase IV using ligase IV mutant 180BR cell (20). Elevated reaction concentrations of Mg²⁺ (10 mM) stimulated DNA end joining through an apparent DNA ligase IV-independent pathway, whereas reduced concentrations of Mg²⁺ (0.5 mM) revealed a DNA ligase IV dependency for low levels of end-joining activity. Interestingly, we observed that under similar conditions, antibodies specific for Ku70, Xrcc4, and BRCA1 efficiently suppressed DNA end-joining activity at reduced concentrations of Mg²⁺ (Fig. 4). These observations raise the possibility that BRCA1 works along with Rad50, Ku, and Xrcc4 in NHEJ at a low concentration of Mg²⁺. Interestingly, mammalian cell extracts deficient in Fanconi anemia proteins had a 3–9-fold reduction in DNA end-joining activity at high Mg²⁺ concentration (10 mM) in a pathway independent of DNA-PK/Ku (28). Therefore, it is very likely that multiple NHEJ pathways may exist in mammalian cells.

Previously, BRCA1 has been implicated in homology-based repairs of DNA breaks because cells expressing a *Brcal* exon 11-deletion mutant exhibit defects in gene targeting, single-strand annealing, and gene conversion (10). Interestingly, no defects in plasmid integration and nonhomologous repair processes were observed in these *Brcal* mutant cells. However, it is possible that the NHEJ activity observed in this previous study described by Moynahan *et al.* (10), reflects the contribution of a BRCA1-independent NHEJ pathway. Alternatively, genetic differences between independently derived *Brcal* mutant cell lines may contribute to different conclusions regarding the importance of *Brcal* in NHEJ. Our *Brcal* mutant allele carries a reverse-oriented neomycin cassette inserted into the 5' end of *Brcal* exon 11, which will lead to premature termination of translation (29). No stable *Brcal* protein derivative can be detected in our *Brcal*^{-/-} MEFs. The embryonic stem (ES) cells previously characterized for defects in homologous and NHEJ repair (10), express a *Brcal* exon 11 splice variant (30) and the homozygote embryos derived from these ES cells exhibit a less severe phenotype than our homozygotes (29, 30). Using our *Brcal*^{-/-} MEFs, we have demonstrated a 50–100-fold reduced efficiency in microhomology-mediated end-joining activity of a defined chromosomal DNA DSB introduced by a rare-cutting endonuclease I-SceI (31). These results further support a role of BRCA1 in NHEJ.

The findings presented here suggest that BRCA1 functions in the repair of DSBs through a novel role in NHEJ, consistent with the recent report that a single mutated BRCA1 allele leads to impaired fidelity of DSB end joining (32). Inefficient or error-prone DNA repair resulting directly from inactivation of BRCA1 could lead to global genomic instability and a concomitant accrual of functionally inactivating mutations at genetic loci involved in breast tumorigenesis. Additional mechanistic studies concerning the role of BRCA1 in DNA damage response and repair should expedite the design and implementation of strategies to delay, and ultimately to prevent, breast cancer formation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Diane Jones and Chi-Fen Chen for excellent technical assistance.

REFERENCES

- Chen, Y., Lee, W. H., and Chew, H. K. Emerging roles of BRCA1 in transcriptional regulation and DNA repair. *J. Cell. Physiol.*, **181**: 385–392, 1999.
- Welch, P. L., Owens, K. N., and King, M. C. Insights into the functions of BRCA1 and BRCA2. *Trends Genet.*, **16**: 69–74, 2000.
- Zheng, L., Li, S., Boyer, T. G., and Lee, W.-H. Lessons learned from BRCA1 and BRCA2. *Oncogene*, **19**: 6159–6175, 2000.
- Xu, X., Weaver, Z., Linke, S. P., Li, C., Gotay, J., Wang, X. W., Harris, C. C., Ried, T., and Deng, C. X. Centrosome amplification and a defective G₂-M cell cycle checkpoint induce genetic instability in BRCA1 exon 11 isoform-deficient cells. *Mol. Cell*, **3**: 389–395, 1999.
- Tomlinson, G. E., Chen, T.-L., Stastny, V. A., Virmani, A. K., Spillman, M. A., Tonk, V., Blum, J. L., Schneider, N. R., Wistuba, I. I., Shay, J. W., Minna, J. D., and Gazzar, A. F. Characterization of a breast cancer cell line derived from a germ-line *BRCA1* mutation carrier. *Cancer Res.*, **58**: 3237–3242, 1998.
- Gowen, L. C., Avrutskaya, A. V., Latour, A. M., Koller, B. H., and Leadon, S. A. BRCA1 required for transcription-coupled repair of oxidative DNA damage. *Science* (Wash. DC), **281**: 1009–1012, 1998.
- Cressman, V. L., Backlund, D. C., Avrutskaya, A. V., Leadon, S. A., Godfrey, V., and Koller, B. H. Growth retardation, DNA repair defects, and lack of spermatogenesis in BRCA1-deficient mice. *Mol. Cell. Biol.*, **19**: 7061–7075, 1999.
- Zhong, Q., Chen, C. F., Li, S., Chen, Y., Wang, C. C., Xiao, J., Chen, P. L., Sharp, Z. D., and Lee, W. H. Association of BRCA1 with the hRad50-hMre11-p95 complex and the DNA damage response. *Science* (Wash. DC), **285**: 747–750, 1999.
- Scully, R., Ganesan, S., Vlasakova, K., Chen, J., Socolovsky, M., and Livingston, D. M. Genetic analysis of BRCA1 function in a defined tumor cell line. *Mol. Cell*, **4**: 1093–1099, 1999.
- Moynahan, M. E., Chiu, J. W., Koller, B. H., and Jaslin, M. *Brcal* controls homology-directed DNA repair. *Mol. Cell*, **4**: 511–518, 1999.
- Haber, J. E. The many interfaces of Mre11. *Cell*, **95**: 583–586, 1998.
- Tsukamoto, Y., and Ikeda, H. Double-strand break repair mediated by DNA end-joining. *Genes Cells*, **3**: 135–144, 1998.
- Paull, T. T., and Gellert, M. The 3' to 5' exonuclease activity of Mre 11 facilitates repair of DNA double-strand breaks. *Mol. Cell*, **1**: 969–979, 1998.
- Paull, T. T., and Gellert, M. A mechanistic basis for Mre11-directed DNA joining at microhomologies. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, **97**: 6409–6414, 2000.
- Chen, L., Trujillo, K., Ramos, W., Sung, P., and Tomkinson, A. E. Promotion of Dnl4-catalyzed DNA end-joining by the Rad50/Mre11/Xrs2 and Hdf1/Hdf2 complexes. *Mol. Cell*, **8**: 1105–1115, 2001.
- Baumann, P., and West, S. C. DNA end-joining catalyzed by human cell-free extracts. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, **95**: 14066–14070, 1998.
- Zheng, L., Pan, H., Li, S., Flesken-Nikitin, A., Chen, P. L., Boyer, T. G., and Lee, W. H. Sequence-specific transcriptional corepressor function for BRCA1 through a novel zinc finger protein. *ZBRK1*. *Mol. Cell*, **6**: 757–768, 2000.
- Boyer, T. G., Martin, M. E., Lees, E., Ricciardi, R. P., and Berk, A. J. Mammalian Srb/Mediator complex is targeted by adenovirus E1A protein. *Nature* (Lond.), **399**: 276–279, 1999.
- Durfee, T., Mancini, M. A., Jones, D., Eledge, S. J., and Lee, W.-H. The amino-terminal region of the retinoblastoma gene product binds a novel nuclear matrix protein that co-localizes to centers for RNA processing. *J. Cell Biol.*, **127**: 609–622, 1994.
- Wang, H., Zeng, Z. C., Perrault, A. R., Cheng, X., Qin, W., and Iliakis, G. Genetic evidence for the involvement of DNA ligase IV in the DNA-PK-dependent pathway of non-homologous end joining in mammalian cells. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **29**: 1653–1660, 2001.
- Huang, J., and Dynan, W. S. Reconstitution of the mammalian DNA double-strand break end-joining reaction reveals a requirement for an Mre11/Rad50/NBS1-containing fraction. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **30**: 667–674, 2002.
- de Jager, M., van Noort, J., van Gent, D. C., Dekker, C., Kanaar, R., and Wyman, C. Human Rad50/Mre11 is a flexible complex that can tether DNA ends. *Mol. Cell*, **8**: 1129–1135, 2001.
- Paull, T. T., Cortez, D., Bowers, B., Eledge, S. J., and Gellert, M. From the cover: direct DNA binding by Brcal. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, **98**: 6086–6091, 2001.
- North, P., Ganesh, A., and Thacker, J. The rejoicing of double-strand breaks in DNA by human cell extracts. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **18**: 6205–6210, 1990.
- Johnson, A. P., and Fairman, M. P. The identification and characterization of mammalian proteins involved in the rejoicing of DNA double-strand breaks *in vitro*. *Mutat. Res.*, **364**: 103–116, 1996.
- Feldmann, E., Schmiemann, V., Goedcke, W., Reichenberger, S., and Pfeiffer, P. DNA double-strand break repair in cell-free extracts from Ku80-deficient cells: implications for Ku serving as an alignment factor in non-homologous DNA end joining. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **28**: 2585–2596, 2000.
- Cheong, N., Perrault, A. R., Wang, H., Wachsmuth, P., Mammil, P., Jackson, I., and Iliakis, G. DNA-PK-independent rejoicing of DNA double-strand breaks in human cell extracts *in vitro*. *Int. J. Radiat. Biol.*, **75**: 67–81, 1999.
- Lundberg, R., Mavinakere, M., and Campbell, C. Deficient DNA end joining activity in extracts from Fanconi anemia fibroblasts. *J. Biol. Chem.*, **276**: 9543–9549, 2001.
- Liu, C. Y., Flesken-Nikitin, A., Li, S., Zeng, Y. Y., and Lee, W.-H. Inactivation of the mouse *Brcal* gene leads to failure in the morphogenesis of the egg cylinder in early postimplantation development. *Genes Dev.*, **10**: 1835–1843, 1996.
- Gowen, L. C., Johnson, B. L., Latour, A. M., Sulik, K. K., and Koller, B. H. *Brcal* deficiency results in early embryonic lethality characterized by neuroepithelial abnormalities. *Nat. Genet.*, **12**: 191–194, 1996.
- Zhong, Q., Chen, C. F., Chen, P. L., and Lee, W.-H. BRCA1 facilitates microhomology-mediated end-joining of DNA double-strand breaks. *J. Biol. Chem.*, in press, 2002.
- Baldeyron, C., Jacquemin, E., Smith, J., Jacquemont, C., De Oliveira, I., Gad, S., Feunteun, J., Stoppa-Lyonnet, D., and Papadopoulou, D. A single mutated BRCA1 allele leads to impaired fidelity of double strand break end-joining. *Oncogene*, **21**: 1401–1410, 2002.

Functional Dissection of Transcription Factor ZBRK1 Reveals Zinc Fingers with Dual Roles in DNA-binding and BRCA1-dependent Transcriptional Repression*

Received for publication, November 10, 2003, and in revised form, November 26, 2003
Published, JBC Papers in Press, December 2, 2003, DOI 10.1074/jbc.M312270200

Wei Tan‡, Lei Zheng‡, Wen-Hwa Lee§, and Thomas G. Boyer‡¶

From the ‡Department of Molecular Medicine and Institute of Biotechnology, University of Texas Health Science Center, San Antonio, Texas 78245-3207 and the §Department of Biological Chemistry, University of California, Irvine, California 92697-1700

The breast- and ovarian-specific tumor suppressor BRCA1 has been implicated in both activation and repression of gene transcription by virtue of its direct interaction with sequence-specific DNA-binding transcription factors. However, the mechanistic basis by which BRCA1 mediates the transcriptional activity of these regulatory proteins remains largely unknown. To clarify this issue, we have examined the functional interaction between BRCA1 and ZBRK1, a BRCA1-dependent KRAB eight zinc finger transcriptional repressor. We report here the identification and molecular characterization of a portable BRCA1-dependent transcriptional repression domain within ZBRK1 composed of zinc fingers 5–8 along with sequences in the unique ZBRK1 C terminus. This C-terminal repression domain functions in a BRCA1-, histone deacetylase-, and promoter-specific manner and is thus functionally distinguishable from the N-terminal KRAB repression domain in ZBRK1, which exhibits no BRCA1 dependence and broad promoter specificity. Significantly, we also find that the BRCA1-dependent transcriptional repression domain on ZBRK1 includes elements that modulate its sequence-specific DNA binding activity. These findings thus reveal the presence within ZBRK1 of functionally bipartite zinc fingers with dual roles in sequence-specific DNA-binding and BRCA1-dependent transcriptional repression. We discuss the implications of these findings for the role of BRCA1 as ZBRK1 co-repressor.

Germ line inactivation of the gene encoding BRCA1 confers a cumulative lifetime risk of female breast and ovarian cancer (1–3). Although the mechanistic basis for its tissue- and gender-specific tumor suppressor activity remains poorly defined, BRCA1 nonetheless fulfills a broad function in the maintenance of global genome stability (4–10). The underlying basis for this caretaker activity likely derives from the role of BRCA1 as a conduit in the cellular DNA damage response, wherein it serves to couple DNA damage-induced signals to downstream

* This work was supported by United States Army Department of Defense Grant DAMD17-02-1-0584 (to T. G. B.), United States Army Department of Defense Training Grant (to W. T.), and National Institutes of Health Grants CA94170, CA81020 (to W.-H. L.), and CA098301-01 (to T. G. B.). The costs of publication of this article were defrayed in part by the payment of page charges. This article must therefore be hereby marked “advertisement” in accordance with 18 U.S.C. Section 1734 solely to indicate this fact.

¶ To whom correspondence should be addressed: Dept. of Molecular Medicine and Institute of Biotechnology, University of Texas Health Science Center, 15355 Lambda Dr., San Antonio, TX 78245-3207. Tel.: 210-567-7258; Fax: 210-567-7377; E-mail: boyer@uthscsa.edu.

responses including DNA damage repair and cell cycle checkpoint activation (6, 7, 11–21). Several potentially overlapping cellular activities have been ascribed to BRCA1, each of which could underlie its ability to control signal output. For example, BRCA1 has been implicated in chromatin remodeling, ubiquitination, recombination, and transcriptional regulation (6, 22–28). The extent to which these pleiotropic activities contribute to the caretaker function of BRCA1 is presently unknown; however, the fact that each of these BRCA1-associated activities are similarly abrogated by cancer-predisposing BRCA1 missense mutations suggests a strong correlative link between their discharge and BRCA1-mediated tumor suppression.

With respect to its role in transcription control, BRCA1 has been implicated in both activation and repression of genes linked to a variety of biological processes, including cell growth control and DNA replication and repair (21, 29–31). Thus, by virtue of its transcriptional regulatory activity, BRCA1 could influence cellular responses downstream of DNA damage signals, and this activity could contribute to its caretaker function.

The precise role of BRCA1 in gene-specific transcription control has yet to be definitively established. Because it exhibits no sequence-specific DNA binding activity, it seems likely that BRCA1 is targeted to specific genes through its functional interaction with sequence-specific DNA-binding transcription factors. Direct evidence to support this hypothesis has come from the identification of multiple DNA-binding transcription factors with which BRCA1 has been shown to physically interact and functionally synergize, including p53, c-Myc, estrogen receptor α , androgen receptor, OCT-1, NF-YA, and ZBRK1 (32–40). However, the underlying mechanism by which BRCA1 mediates the transcriptional stimulatory or repressive effects of these regulatory proteins has not been established.

We have been studying the functional interaction between BRCA1 and the transcriptional repressor ZBRK1 as a model system to understand the mechanistic basis by which BRCA1 mediates sequence-specific transcription control. Initially identified by virtue of its physical interaction with BRCA1, ZBRK1 (Zinc finger and BRCA1-interacting protein with a KRAB domain 1) is a member of the Kruppel-associated box-zinc finger protein (KRAB-ZFP) family of transcriptional repressors (39, 41). Typically, KRAB-ZFPs bind to their corresponding target genes through tandem C-terminal C_2H_2 zinc fingers and repress transcription through an N-terminal KRAB domain, which silences gene expression through the indirect recruitment of histone deacetylases, histone methyltransferases, and heterochromatin proteins (41–47). Like other KRAB-ZFPs, ZBRK1 harbors an N-terminal KRAB domain. However, ZBRK1 is atypical among KRAB-ZFPs due to the fact that it harbors 8 central C_2H_2 zinc fingers and a unique C terminus

that is absent among the larger family of KRAB-ZFPs.

Through its 8 central zinc fingers, ZBRK1 binds to a compositionally flexible 15-bp DNA sequence, GGG_xxCAG_{xx}TTT (where x is any nucleotide) (39). A search for potential ZBRK1 DNA-binding sites in existing genes led to intron 3 of GADD45a, a functionally important DNA damage-response effector known to be regulated transcriptionally by BRCA1 (21, 32, 39). Functional analysis revealed that ZBRK1 represses GADD45a gene transcription through its intron 3 DNA-binding site in a BRCA1-dependent manner, thus revealing BRCA1 to be a ZBRK1 co-repressor (39). Significantly, familial breast cancer-derived mutants of BRCA1 that disrupt its interaction with ZBRK1 abrogate its co-repressor activity, suggesting that its co-repressor function may be important for the tumor suppressor properties of BRCA1 (39). The regulation of GADD45a gene transcription is likely to be complex and controlled coordinately by ZBRK1 and BRCA1 in concert with other trans-acting factors, including p53, OCT1, and NF-YA, that function through cis-acting sequences present in the GADD45a promoter and intron 3 regions (21, 32, 39, 48, 49).

In addition to GADD45a, potential ZBRK1-binding sites have been identified in other DNA damage-response genes that are also regulated by BRCA1, including p21, Bax, and GADD153 (39). This observation suggests a potentially broader role for BRCA1 and ZBRK1 in the coordinate transcriptional regulation of diverse DNA damage-response genes. To begin to explore the mechanism by which BRCA1 mediates sequence-specific transcriptional repression through ZBRK1, we have pursued in greater depth the physical and functional interaction between these two proteins. We report here the identification and molecular characterization of a portable BRCA1-dependent transcriptional repression domain within ZBRK1 composed of zinc fingers 5–8 along with sequences in the unique ZBRK1 C terminus. This C-terminal repression domain functions in a BRCA1-, histone deacetylase (HDAC)-¹ and promoter-specific manner and is thus functionally distinguishable from the N-terminal KRAB repression domain in ZBRK1, which exhibits no BRCA1 dependence and broad promoter specificity. Significantly, we also find that the BRCA1-dependent C-terminal transcriptional repression domain within ZBRK1 is composed of elements that modulate sequence-specific DNA-binding by zinc fingers 1–4. These findings thus reveal an unanticipated dual function for the ZBRK1 zinc fingers in DNA binding and transcriptional repression, and further shed new light on the mechanistic role of BRCA1 in sequence-specific transcriptional control.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

Plasmid Construction and Mutagenesis

Expression Plasmids—pMAL-C2-TEV-ZBRK1 Δ K for expressing MBP-ZBRK1 Δ K in *Escherichia coli* was derived from pGEPK3-ZBRK1 Δ K, which is a derivative of pCNF-ZBRK1 Δ K (39). Briefly, a BamHI-XhoI fragment carrying ZBRK1 cDNA sequences encoding ZBRK1 amino acids 144–532 (lacking the N-terminal KRAB domain) was subcloned into the BamHI and XhoI sites of pMAL-C2-TEV (provided by Dr. P. Renee Yew), thereby generating a translational fusion of MBP and ZBRK1 Δ K. C-terminal truncation mutants of MBP-ZBRK1 Δ K bearing stepwise deletions of individual ZBRK1 zinc fingers were expressed from pMAL-C2-TEV-ZBRK1 Δ K deletion derivatives, each of which was constructed by PCR-based subcloning. Briefly, sequences encoding ZBRK1 Δ K within pMAL-C2-TEV-ZBRK1 Δ K were liberated as a BamHI-HindIII fragment and replaced with corresponding PCR-

generated ZBRK1 deletion fragments using a common upstream primer corresponding to MBP sequences and unique downstream primers within the C terminus of each zinc finger (defined here as the seventh amino acid residue C-terminal to the last histidine residue of each C₂H₂ zinc finger). Individual MBP-ZBRK1 Δ K deletion derivatives encode the following ZBRK1 amino acids (aa): MBP-ZBRK1 Δ K 8ZF (aa 144–431); 7ZF (aa 144–403); 6ZF (aa 144–377); 5ZF (aa 144–347); 4ZF (aa 144–319); 3ZF (aa 144–291); 2ZF (aa 144–263); and 1ZF (aa 144–235). Individual MBP-ZBRK1 Δ K broken finger (BF) mutants were generated by PCR-based site-directed mutagenesis of pMAL-C2-TEV-ZBRK1 Δ K using the QuickChange II site-directed mutagenesis kit following the manufacturer's recommendations (Stratagene, La Jolla, CA). Each broken finger mutant bears a histidine (CAT codon) to asparagine (aaT codon) substitution mutation at the first of the two conserved histidine residues within the targeted C₂H₂ zinc finger.

ZBRK1 5ZFC was expressed as a GAL4 DNA-binding domain fusion in mammalian cells from the plasmid GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC, constructed by subcloning a PCR-amplified ZBRK1 cDNA fragment encoding amino acids 319–532 (encompassing zinc finger 5 through the C terminus) into the SalI and HindIII sites of pM (Clontech, Palo Alto, CA). N- and C-terminal truncation derivatives of GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC bearing stepwise deletions of individual zinc fingers and C-terminal sequences, respectively, were generated by PCR-based subcloning. Briefly, the SalI-HindIII fragment within GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC encoding ZBRK1 5ZFC was replaced with corresponding PCR-generated ZBRK1 deletion fragments. Individual GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC deletion derivatives encode the following ZBRK1 amino acids (aa): GAL4-ZBRK1 6ZFC (aa 347–532); 7ZFC (aa 375–532); 8ZFC (aa 403–532); C (aa 431–532); GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC Δ 1 (aa 319–523); 5ZFC Δ 2 (aa 319–503); and 5ZFC Δ 3 (aa 319–483). Broken finger derivatives of GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC were generated by PCR amplification of ZBRK1 sequences encoding amino acids 319–532 from individual pMAL-C2-TEV ZBRK1 Δ K BF mutants and subsequent replacement of the SalI-HindIII wild-type ZBRK1 fragment in GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC.

ZBRK1 5ZFC and its truncation and broken finger derivatives were expressed in yeast as GAL4 activation domain fusions using pGADT7 (Clontech, Palo Alto, CA). Briefly, ZBRK1 5ZFC and its truncation (6ZFC, 7ZFC, 8ZFC, 0ZFC, 5ZFC Δ 1, 5ZFC Δ 2, and 5ZFC Δ 3) and broken finger (BF5, BF6, BF7, and BF8) derivatives were excised as BamHI-blunted SalI fragments from GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC and its corresponding derivative plasmids, and subcloned into the BamHI and blunted XhoI sites in pGADT7. A BRCA1 cDNA fragment (encoding amino acids 341–748) encompassing the ZBRK1-binding domain (39) was PCR-amplified and subcloned into the EcoRI and SalI sites of pGBKT7, thereby generating a translational fusion of the GAL4 DNA-binding domain with BRCA1 amino acids 341–748 in the plasmid pGBKT7-BRCA1.

The ZBRK1 KRAB domain was expressed as a GAL4 DNA-binding domain fusion in mammalian cells from GAL4-ZBRK1 KRAB, constructed by subcloning a PCR-amplified ZBRK1 cDNA fragment encoding amino acids 1–85 into the BamHI and blunted XbaI sites of pM2 (50). All PCR-based subcloning was performed using *Pfu* DNA polymerase (Stratagene, La Jolla, CA), and the integrity of individual deletion and substitution mutations was confirmed by DNA sequence analysis.

Reporter Plasmids—pG₅TK-Luc carrying five copies of the GAL4 DNA-binding site upstream of the herpes simplex virus thymidine kinase (TK) promoter (sequences corresponding to -105 to $+51$, where $+1$ is the transcription start site) driving expression of the gene encoding firefly luciferase was constructed by replacing a HindIII-BglII fragment from pSBS-GAL-TK-Luc (provided by Dr. Tony Ip) with a HindIII-BglII fragment from pG₅TK-CAT (provided by Dr. P. Renee Yew), thus positioning five copies of the GAL4 DNA-binding site and the TK promoter upstream of the firefly luciferase gene. pG₅SV40-Luc carrying five GAL4 DNA-binding sites upstream of the SV40 promoter driving expression of the firefly luciferase gene has been described previously (39). pG₅SNRPN-Luc (provided by Dr. Paul A. Wade) carries five GAL4 DNA-binding sites upstream of the human small nuclear ribonucleoprotein N promoter driving expression of the firefly luciferase gene (51).

Recombinant Protein Expression and Purification

MBP-ZBRK1 fusion proteins were expressed in and purified from *E. coli* strain BL21 Star (DE3) pLysS (Invitrogen). Briefly, cells were grown at 37 °C to an A_{600} of 0.6. Isopropyl-1-thio- β -D-galactopyranoside was added to a final concentration 0.3 mM, and the cells were transferred to 25 °C for another 3.5 h. Cells were pelleted, washed once with phosphate-buffered saline, and then resuspended in MBP binding buffer (25 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.5; 1 mM EDTA; 200 mM NaCl; 20 μ M

¹ The abbreviations used are: HDAC, histone deacetylase; EMSA, electrophoretic mobility shift assay; MEFs, mouse embryo fibroblasts; aa, amino acids; MBP, maltose-binding protein; PMSF, phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride; TSA, trichostatin A; ZRE, ZBRK1-response element; BF, broken finger; TK, thymidine kinase; WT, wild type; Mut., mutant; HSV, herpes simplex virus.




FIG. 1. Identification of DNA binding determinants on ZBRK1. *A*, schematic representation of ZBRK1 (the KRAB domain and numbered zinc fingers are indicated), MBP-ZBRK1 ΔK, and MBP-ZBRK1 ΔK truncation derivatives. *B*, purified MBP-ZBRK1 ΔK and its corresponding truncation derivatives as indicated were resolved by SDS-10% PAGE and visualized by Coomassie Blue staining. Molecular weight marker positions (M_r) are indicated. *C*, competition EMSA. EMSA was performed using a ^{32}P -labeled double-stranded oligonucleotide probe corresponding to a wild-type consensus ZRE and purified MBP-ZBRK1 ΔK (1st lane). A 100-, 200-, or 400-fold molar excess of an unlabeled wild-type (WT) ZRE probe (2nd to 4th lanes) or mutated (Mut.) ZRE probe corresponding to a double-stranded oligonucleotide identical in length but different in sequence (5th to 7th lanes) was added to the binding reaction as indicated. The positions of the unbound ZRE oligonucleotide probe (ZRE) and the ZRE-MBP-ZBRK1 ΔK nucleoprotein complex (ZRE-ZBRK1) are indicated. For each EMSA reaction, the proportional fraction of ZRE probe bound by MBP-ZBRK1 ΔK is indicated below each lane and was determined by dividing the number of radioactive counts in the bound probe by the number of radioactive counts in the bound plus the unbound probe. *D* and *E*, sequence-specific DNA binding activity of MBP-ZBRK1 ΔK and its corresponding truncation derivatives. EMSA was performed using the consensus ZRE probe and 50 ng of either MBP-ZBRK1 ΔK or each of its corresponding deletion derivatives as indicated. NP indicates no protein added to the EMSA reaction. The positions of the unbound ZRE oligonucleotide probe (ZRE) and the ZRE-MBP-ZBRK1 ΔK nucleoprotein complex (ZRE-ZBRK1) are indicated. DNA-binding reactions were performed in 100 mM NaCl (*D*) or 200 mM NaCl (*E*). For each EMSA reaction, the proportional fraction of ZRE probe bound by MBP-ZBRK1 ΔK or its truncation derivatives is indicated below each lane and was determined by dividing the number of radioactive counts in the bound probe by the number of radioactive counts in the bound plus the unbound probe. ND, not detectable.

ZnCl₂; and 10 mM β -mercaptoethanol) supplemented with protease inhibitors (aprotinin 0.4 $\mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$; chymostatin 0.5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$; leupeptin 0.5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$; pepstatin 0.5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$; PMSF 0.5 mM; and benzamidine-HCl 0.5 mM). Resuspended cells were frozen and thawed one time, followed by sonication (3 times for 1 min) and clarification by centrifugation at 30,000 $\times g$ for 30 min. MBP-ZBRK1 fusion proteins were purified from clarified lysates by affinity chromatography on amylose resin (New England Biolabs, Beverly, MA). Briefly, clarified lysates were incubated with amylose resin in batch for 1 h at 4 °C, washed 3 times with MBP binding buffer, and then eluted with MBP binding buffer containing 0.5% maltose for 30 min at 4 °C. Purified proteins (estimated to be >95% homogeneous by SDS-PAGE and subsequent visualization by Coomassie Blue staining) were dialyzed for 1 h at 4 °C against EMSA storage buffer (25 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.5; 100 mM NaCl; 20 μM ZnCl₂; 10% glycerol; 10 mM β -mercaptoethanol; and 0.5 mM PMSF) before long term storage at -80 °C.

Electrophoretic Mobility Shift Assay (EMSA)

For EMSA, the ZRE probe was obtained by annealing two complementary oligonucleotides corresponding in sequence to the consensus ZBRK1 DNA-binding site: 5'-GATCCACGGGACGCAGGTGTTTGT-GCCG-3' and 5'-GATCCGGCACAAACACCTGCGTCCCGTG-3' (39). Mutant (Mut.) probe was obtained by annealing two oligonucleotides,

5'-GATCCACCTCACGTTCTGCACTGTGCCG-3' and 5'-GATCCG-GCACAGTGCACGAACGTGAGGTG-3' (39). Each of these double-stranded probes carried overhanging ends, which were filled in with [α - ^{32}P]dCTP by Klenow enzyme. In each reaction, purified MBP-ZBRK1 fusion proteins (50 ng) were incubated with 6000 cpm of a ^{32}P -labeled double-stranded oligonucleotide probe in 30 μl of EMSA binding buffer (25 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.5; 20 μM ZnCl₂; 12.5% glycerol; 0.5 mM PMSF; and a variable concentration of NaCl as indicated). Following 30 min of incubation at room temperature, reaction mixtures were loaded onto a 5% non-denaturing polyacrylamide gel and electrophoresed at 200 V for 2 h at 4 °C in 0.5× TBE. Dried gels were subjected to PhosphorImager analysis (Amersham Biosciences).

Cell Culture, Transfections, and Reporter Assays

Brca1^{-/-}, p53^{-/-} (*Brca1*^{-/-}), and p53^{-/-} (*Brca1*^{+/+}) mouse embryo fibroblasts (MEFs) (39) and U2OS human osteosarcoma cells were cultured in Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium (Invitrogen) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (Hyclone, Logan, UT). *Brca1*^{+/+}, *Brca1*^{-/-}, and U2OS cells were transfected at 60% confluence using Effectene reagent (Qiagen, Valencia, CA), and the expression and reporter plasmids are indicated in each figure. Each transfection also included an internal control plasmid, pCH110 (40), expressing β -galactosidase under control of the SV40 promoter. Forty-eight hours

FIG. 2. Identification of DNA-binding determinants on ZBRK1. *A*, schematic representation of ZBRK1, MBP-ZBRK1 Δ K, and MBP-ZBRK1 Δ K broken finger derivatives. *B*, purified MBP-ZBRK1 Δ K and its corresponding broken finger derivatives as indicated were resolved by SDS-10% PAGE and visualized by Coomassie Blue staining. Molecular weight marker positions (M_r) are indicated. *C*, sequence-specific DNA binding activity of MBP-ZBRK1 Δ K and its corresponding broken finger derivatives. EMSA was performed using the consensus ZRE probe and 50 ng of either MBP-ZBRK1 Δ K or each of its corresponding broken finger derivatives as indicated. NP indicates no protein added to the EMSA reaction. The positions of the unbound ZRE oligonucleotide probe (ZRE) and the ZRE-MBP-ZBRK1 Δ K nucleoprotein complex (ZRE-ZBRK1) are indicated. DNA-binding reactions were performed in 200 mM NaCl. For each EMSA reaction, the proportional fraction of ZRE probe bound by MBP-ZBRK1 Δ K or its broken finger derivatives is indicated below each lane and was determined by dividing the number of radioactive counts in the bound probe by the number of radioactive counts in the bound plus the unbound probe. ND, not detectable.

post-transfection, cells were harvested and lysed in Reporter Lysis buffer (Promega, Madison, WI). Transfected cell lysates (20 μ l) were analyzed for luciferase activity using the luciferase assay system (Promega, Madison, WI) and for β -galactosidase activity using the Galacto-light Plus Chemiluminescent Reporter Assay (BD Biosciences). Each transfection was repeated a minimum of 3 times in duplicate.

Yeast Two-hybrid Interaction Assay


pGADT7-ZBRK1 5ZFC and its truncation (6ZFC, 7ZFC, 8ZFC, 0ZFC, 5ZFC Δ 1, 5ZFC Δ 2, and 5ZFC Δ 3) and broken finger (BF5, BF6, BF7, and BF8) derivatives were individually co-transformed along with pGBT7-BRCA1 (expressing BRCA1 amino acids 341–748) into the yeast strain Y187 (BD Biosciences/Clontech). After selection, colonies were expanded in liquid culture for assay of β -galactosidase activity following previously established procedures (39).

Transient Expression Analysis

Steady-state levels of GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC protein and its truncation and substitution derivatives were comparatively analyzed by immunoblot analysis of transfected whole cell extracts in order to verify equivalent levels of ectopic protein expression. Briefly, U2OS cells transfected with GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC, truncation mutants GAL4-ZBRK1 6ZFC, 7ZFC, 8ZFC, 0ZFC, 5ZFC Δ 1, 5ZFC Δ 2, and 5ZFC Δ 3, and broken finger mutants GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC BF5, BF6, BF7, and BF8 were lysed in Laemmli sample buffer, resolved by SDS-10% PAGE, and subjected to immunoblot analysis using an antibody directed against the GAL4 DNA-binding domain (sc-510, Santa Cruz Biotechnology, Santa Cruz, CA) and, as an internal control protein, the p89 subunit of TFIIH (sc-293, Santa Cruz Biotechnology, Santa Cruz, CA). Immunodetection was performed using ECL Western blotting detection reagents (Amersham Biosciences).

RESULTS

Identification of DNA-binding Determinants on ZBRK1— Previously, we demonstrated a strict requirement for BRCA1 in ZBRK1 repression. Specifically, we showed that ZBRK1 repression function was similarly abrogated by genetic ablation of *Bra1* or by deletion of the BRCA1-binding domain on ZBRK1 (39). The BRCA1-binding domain on ZBRK1 includes the last four of eight ZBRK1 zinc fingers (zinc fingers 5–8) along with the ZBRK1 C terminus (39). Whether and how this zinc finger domain contributes to the sequence-specific DNA binding activity of ZBRK1, however, is presently unknown.






FIG. 3. Identification of BRCA1-binding determinants on ZBRK1. The ZBRK1-binding region on BRCA1 (amino acids 341–748) (39), expressed as a GAL4 DNA-binding domain fusion protein (in the plasmid pGADT7), was tested for interaction with the indicated fragments of ZBRK1 fused to the GAL4 transactivation domain (plasmid pGADT7) in yeast two-hybrid assays. β -Galactosidase activities were quantified as described previously (39). Corresponding β -galactosidase activities obtained with each pGADT7-ZBRK1 5ZFC derivative are expressed relative to that observed with the backbone pGADT7 expression vector alone, which was arbitrarily assigned a value of 1. Values represent the average of three independent assays, each performed in triplicate, and *error bars* represent the mean \pm S.D. As a comparative measure of interaction strength, the average β -galactosidase activity obtained with pGADT7-p53 and pGADT7-Large T antigen was 512 ± 13.5 . The validity of two-hybrid interactions observed in these experiments was further substantiated by the following controls. First, we confirmed that the observed β -galactosidase activities were dependent upon BRCA1 sequences expressed from the plasmid pGADT7-BRCA1 by performing a parallel series of interaction assays with individual pGADT7-ZBRK1 5ZFC derivatives and the backbone vector pGADT7 as a negative control. Second, immunoblot analyses of yeast whole cell extracts confirmed that each of the pGADT7-ZBRK1 5ZFC fusion proteins was expressed at roughly equivalent levels, thus excluding the possibility that differences in β -galactosidase activities derive from difference in fusion protein expression.

100 mM NaCl, truncation of the ZBRK1 C terminus (MBP-ZBRK1 Δ K 8ZF) did not appreciably affect DNA binding relative to intact MBP-ZBRK1 Δ K (Fig. 1D). Interestingly, deletion of the eighth and last ZBRK1 zinc finger along with the C terminus (MBP-ZBRK1 Δ K 7ZF) led to an increase in DNA binding activity, suggesting that ZBRK1 ZF8, and possibly the C terminus, constrains sequence-specific DNA binding mediated by the first seven zinc fingers (Fig. 1D). This effect was exacerbated under more stringent DNA binding conditions (200 mM NaCl) (Fig. 1E). At 100 mM NaCl, stepwise truncation of zinc fingers 7 to 5 led to a slight incremental reduction in sequence-specific DNA binding activity (Fig. 1D). ZBRK1 derivatives bearing less than four zinc fingers failed to bind to DNA, thereby establishing zinc fingers 1–4 as the minimal ZBRK1 DNA-binding domain under these conditions (Fig. 1D). Identical results were observed at 50 mM NaCl (data not

shown). At 200 mM NaCl, zinc fingers 1–5 were required for stable DNA binding, and the inclusion of zinc fingers 6 and 7 incrementally stabilized binding (Fig. 1E).

To examine more rigorously the role of zinc fingers 5–8 in sequence-specific DNA binding by ZBRK1, we examined a set of “broken finger” mutants bearing substitution mutations within each of these zinc fingers. This approach permitted us to assess the individual contribution of each finger within the BRCA1-binding domain to overall DNA binding activity in the context of the eight-fingered ZBRK1 Δ K protein and thereby circumvent potential artifacts arising from analyses of truncation mutants. Each broken finger mutant bears a His-to-Asn substitution mutation at the first of the two conserved His residues within the targeted C_2H_2 zinc finger (Fig. 2, A and B). The relative conservative nature of this substitution eliminates zinc coordination within the targeted finger, thereby disrupting




FIG. 4. ZBRK1 harbors two independent transcriptional repression domains. *A* and *B*, human U2OS cells were transfected with 30 ng of pG₅-TK-Luc bearing five copies of the GAL4 DNA-binding site sequence upstream of the TK promoter without or with the indicated nanogram amounts of GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC (*A*) or GAL4-KRAB (*B*). In this and all subsequent transfection experiments involving effector plasmid titrations, the total amount of DNA in each transfection was fixed by reciprocal titration of the corresponding backbone expression plasmid. Also, in this and all subsequent transfection experiments, the relative luciferase activity represents the ratio of the luciferase activity obtained in a particular transfection to that obtained in cells transfected with only the reporter and pM (GAL4 DNA-binding domain) expression vectors alone. Luciferase activities were first normalized to β -galactosidase activity obtained by co-transfection of the SV40- β -gal vector (15 ng) as described previously (39). Error bars represent the S.D. from the average of at least three independent transfections performed in duplicate. *C*, schematic representation of GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC and GAL4-ZBRK1 KRAB chimeras (amino acid sequences fused to the GAL4 DNA-binding domain are indicated numerically above each chimera) and the pG₅-TK-Luc reporter template used in transfection assays.

its local structure with little effect on the integrity of the remainder of the protein (55, 56). Consistent with the results obtained using C-terminal truncation mutants, analysis of individual BF mutants 5–8 revealed zinc finger 5 to be an important ZBRK1 determinant for stable DNA binding, whereas zinc fingers 6 and 7 promote but are not essential for binding (Fig. 2C). Disruption of zinc finger 8 did not appreciably affect the DNA binding activity of MBP-ZBRK1 Δ K, suggesting that zinc finger 8 is largely dispensable for stable association with DNA (Fig. 2C). Furthermore, local disruption of zinc finger 8 did not relieve constraints on the DNA binding activity of MBP-ZBRK1 Δ K, suggesting that the C terminus of ZBRK1 can also mask the inherent DNA binding activity of ZBRK1 zinc fingers 1–7 (Fig. 2C). In summary, the results of DNA-binding analyses delimit the core ZBRK1 DNA-binding domain to zinc fingers 1–4; these zinc fingers are minimally required for stable DNA binding under relatively non-stringent conditions of ionic strength. Zinc finger 5 is a critical and context-dependent determinant of stable binding and represents the extent of the minimal DNA-binding domain under more stringent binding conditions. Zinc fingers 6 and 7, although nonessential, nonetheless further stabilize DNA binding mediated by zinc fingers 1–5. Finally, zinc finger 8 and the C terminus apparently

destabilize the maximum potential DNA binding activity inherent in zinc fingers 1–7.

Identification of BRCA1-binding Determinants on ZBRK1—Next, we sought to establish more precisely the molecular determinants on ZBRK1 required for BRCA1 binding. Previously, we mapped the BRCA1-binding domain on ZBRK1 to encompass a broad region extending from zinc finger 5 through the C terminus (5ZFC) (39). To more narrowly define the BRCA1-binding determinants on ZBRK1, we examined the contribution of individual zinc fingers 5–8 as well as sequences within the ZBRK1 C terminus to BRCA1 binding using a yeast two-hybrid interaction assay. To this end, individual substitution and truncation mutations within ZBRK1 5ZFC were translationally fused to the GAL4 transactivation domain and tested for their respective abilities to bind to the ZBRK1-interaction domain on BRCA1 (amino acids 341–748), translationally fused to the GAL4 DNA-binding domain in yeast (Fig. 3). Corresponding β -galactosidase activities identified critical determinants of BRCA1 interaction on ZBRK1 to include the C terminus as well as zinc fingers 7 and 8 (Fig. 3). Deletion of only 9 amino acids from the C terminus significantly compromised BRCA1 binding, indicating that the unique C terminus on ZBRK1 is required in its entirety for efficient interaction with BRCA1 (Fig. 3). This observation sug-




Fig. 5. The ZBRK1 5ZFC and KRAB repression domains function in a BRCA1-dependent and BRCA1-independent manner, respectively. *A*, *Brca1*^{+/+} and *Brca1*^{-/-} MEF cells (39) as indicated were transfected with 100 ng of pG₅TK-LUC without or with the indicated nanogram amounts of GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC. *B*, *Brca1*^{-/-} MEF cells were transfected with 100 ng of pG₅TK-Luc and 20 ng of either pM (expressing the GAL4 DNA-binding domain (DBD) alone) or GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC, respectively, without or with the indicated nanogram amounts of pCS2+BRCA1 expressing wild-type human BRCA1. *C*, *Brca1*^{+/+} and *Brca1*^{-/-} MEF cells as indicated were transfected with 100 ng of pG₅TK-Luc without or with the indicated nanogram amounts of GAL4-ZBRK1 KRAB. *A-C*, relative luciferase activities were calculated as described in the legend to Fig. 4. *D*, schematic representation of the GAL4 DNA-binding domain, the GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC and GAL4-ZBRK1 KRAB chimeras, and the pG₅TK-Luc reporter template used in transfection assays.

gests that the overall conformation of the C terminus is likely to be important for BRCA1 interaction. Whereas ZBRK1 zinc fingers 7 and 8 are critical for BRCA1 interaction, zinc fingers 5 and 6 do not appear to contribute to BRCA1 binding (Fig. 3). Taken together, these results indicate that important BRCA1-binding determinants on ZBRK1 include those that also modulate its sequence-specific DNA binding activity in both a positive (zinc finger 7) and negative (zinc finger 8 and the C terminus) manner.

The BRCA1-binding Domain on ZBRK1 Functions as an Autonomous BRCA1-dependent Transcriptional Repression Domain—The fact that BRCA1 contacts ZBRK1 through surfaces that are not essential but nonetheless modulatory with respect to DNA binding suggests several potential mechanisms by which BRCA1 might mediate transcriptional repression by ZBRK1. First, BRCA1 could mediate ZBRK1 repression, at least in part, by modulating its sequence-specific association with DNA. This possibility is currently under investigation. Alternatively, or additionally, BRCA1 could mediate repression by DNA-bound ZBRK1. This possibility is supported by our previous observation that clinically validated missense mutations within the BRCA1 C terminus that do not disrupt its interaction with ZBRK1 nonetheless abrogate its ZBRK1 co-

repressor activity (39). To test this possibility directly, we examined whether the BRCA1-binding domain on ZBRK1 could function as a BRCA1-dependent transcriptional repression domain when tethered to a heterologous DNA-binding domain. This approach permitted us to assess the influence of BRCA1 on the repression function of ZBRK1 independently of any effects that it might have on the DNA binding activity of ZBRK1. Accordingly, we initially tested the ability of ZBRK1 5ZFC (extending from zinc finger 5 to the C terminus) to function as an independent repression domain when linked to the GAL4 DNA-binding domain. GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC was transiently expressed in U2OS human osteosarcoma cells, and its influence on transcription from a pG₅TK-Luc reporter template bearing five copies of the consensus GAL4 DNA-binding site upstream of the herpes simplex virus (HSV) TK gene promoter was examined. GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC conferred greater than 10-fold repression upon reporter gene expression in a dose-dependent manner (Fig. 4A). We also confirmed the presence of a potent KRAB repression domain within the ZBRK1 N terminus by examining its ability to repress pG₅TK-Luc reporter gene expression when tethered to the GAL4 DNA-binding domain (Fig. 4B). Based on quantitative immunoblot analysis of transfected




FIG. 6. Functional analysis of ZBRK1 5ZFC truncation and substitution derivatives. *A–C*, U2OS cells were transfected with 30 ng of $\text{pG}_5\text{TK-Luc}$ and the following amounts of GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC or its indicated derivatives: *A*, 5ZFC, 400 ng; 6ZFC, 7ZFC, 8ZFC, and *C*, 200 ng; *B*, 5ZFC or its indicated broken finger derivatives, 200 ng; *C*, 5ZFC, 400 ng; $\Delta 1$, 200 ng; $\Delta 2$, 400 ng; $\Delta 3$, 200 ng. In each panel, the relative repression level represents the relative luciferase activity obtained with a particular GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC derivative divided by that obtained with GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC. Relative luciferase activities were calculated as described in the legend to Fig. 4. In these experiments, the relative luciferase activity observed with GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC (three independent transfections performed in duplicate) was as follows: *A*, 0.10 corresponding to 10-fold repression of reporter template activity; *B*, 0.21 corresponding to an approximate 5-fold repression of reporter template activity; *C*, 0.08 corresponding to 12.5-fold repression of reporter template activity. To confirm that GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC and its truncation and substitution derivatives are expressed at roughly equivalent levels, lysates from U2OS cells transfected with GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC or its derivatives (the same amounts used in functional analysis and indicated above) were resolved by SDS-10% PAGE and subjected to immunoblot analysis using antibodies specific for the GAL4 DNA-binding domain. Molecular weight marker positions (M_r) are indicated. GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC and its derivatives are represented schematically at the top of each panel.

cell extracts, the ZBRK1 KRAB domain, on a molar basis, appears to be a stronger transcriptional repression domain than the ZBRK1 BRCA1-binding domain (data not shown). Nonetheless, this result indicates the presence within ZBRK1 of two portable transcriptional repression domains, an N-terminal KRAB domain and a novel C-terminal transcriptional repression domain (5ZFC) that encompasses the BRCA1-binding domain.

To confirm the requirement for BRCA1 in transcriptional repression by ZBRK1 5ZFC, we tested the repression function of GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC in *Brcal*^{+/+} and *Brcal*^{-/-} MEF cells. GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC conferred up to 10-fold repression in *Brcal*^{+/+} MEFs, whereas little or no repression activity was observed in *Brcal*^{-/-} MEFs (Fig. 5A). Ectopic expression of BRCA1 in *Brcal*^{-/-} MEFs restored ZBRK1 5ZFC-directed transcriptional repression (Fig. 5B), establishing conclusively that BRCA1 mediates repression by DNA-bound ZBRK1 5ZFC. In contrast to ZBRK1 5ZFC, the ZBRK1 KRAB domain repressed transcription equivalently in both *Brcal*^{+/+} and *Brcal*^{-/-} MEFs (Fig. 5C). Thus, the N-terminal KRAB and C-terminal 5ZFC repression domains within ZBRK1 can be distinguished functionally on the basis of their respective requirements for BRCA1.

BRCA1-binding Is Necessary but Not Sufficient for ZBRK1

5ZFC Repression Function—To more narrowly define the boundaries of the BRCA1-dependent 5ZFC repression domain within ZBRK1, we examined a panel of ZBRK1 5ZFC truncation and substitution mutants for their respective repression activities *in vivo*. Relative to the intact 5ZFC domain, deletion or disruption of zinc fingers 5 or 6 individually reduced repression activity by 2–3-fold (Fig. 6, *A* and *B*), whereas individual deletion or disruption of zinc fingers 7 or 8 reduced repression activity by 3–6-fold (Fig. 6, *A* and *B*). These results indicate that zinc fingers 5–8 are all required for the integrity of the 5ZFC repression domain, although zinc fingers 7 and 8 appear to be quantitatively more important. Deletion of only 9 amino acids from the C terminus of ZBRK1 severely compromised the repression function of the 5ZFC domain, indicating that the entire C terminus is likely to be important for 5ZFC repression activity (Fig. 6C). Thus, the 5ZFC repression domain extending from ZBRK1 zinc finger 5 through the C terminus appears to constitute an intact repression domain that cannot be further delimited. This analysis also reveals an imperfect correlation between BRCA1 binding and transcriptional repression by the 5ZFC repression domain. Thus, disruption of ZBRK1 zinc fingers 7 or 8 or truncation of the C terminus severely compromised BRCA1 binding (Fig. 3) and transcriptional repression (Fig. 6). By contrast, disruption of zinc fingers 5 or 6, which are




Fig. 7. ZBRK1 5ZFC-directed repression is reversed by trichostatin A. *A*, U2OS cells were transfected with 30 ng of $\text{pG}_5\text{TK-Luc}$ without or with the indicated nanogram amounts of GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC or GAL4-ZBRK1 C. Where indicated, TSA (330 nM) was also included. Relative luciferase activities were calculated as described in the legend to Fig. 4. *B*, schematic representation of the GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC and GAL4-ZBRK1 C chimeras and the $\text{pG}_5\text{TK-Luc}$ reporter template used in transfection assays.

not required for BRCA1 binding (Fig. 3), nonetheless significantly compromised transcriptional repression (Fig. 6, *A* and *B*). On this basis we conclude that BRCA1 binding is necessary but not sufficient for 5ZFC repression function. This suggests that ZBRK1 zinc fingers 5 and 6 may possibly contact an additional co-repressor(s).

The BRCA1-dependent 5ZFC Repression Domain Is Histone Deacetylase-dependent and Promoter-specific—Previously, BRCA1 has been shown to interact through its C-terminal BRCT repeats with histone deacetylases (HDACs) 1 and 2 (57). HDACs remove acetyl groups from lysine residues on histone tails and thus promote the formation of transcriptionally repressive chromatin. To determine the contribution of HDAC activity to repression mediated by ZBRK1 5ZFC, we tested the effect of the selective HDAC inhibitor trichostatin A (TSA) on repression mediated by GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC. TSA largely reversed GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC repression in U2OS cells, implicating HDAC activity in this process (Fig. 7).

Like the ZBRK1 5ZFC repression domain, KRAB repression domains function through HDACs as well as through histone methyltransferases and heterochromatin proteins (41–47). This prompted us to comparatively examine the promoter specificities of the ZBRK1 5ZFC and KRAB repression domains. The ZBRK1 N-terminal KRAB domain repressed transcription potently from each of three different RNA polymerase II promoters tested: the SV40 major late, the HSV TK, and the human small nuclear ribonucleoprotein N (SNRPN) promoters (Fig. 8*B*). By contrast, ZBRK1 5ZFC repressed transcription potently from the HSV TK promoter, moderately from the SV40

promoter, and not at all from the SNRPN promoter (Fig. 8*A*). These results indicate that the ZBRK1 KRAB and 5ZFC repression domains can be distinguished functionally not only by their requirement for BRCA1 but also on the basis of their promoter specificities; whereas the ZBRK1 KRAB repression domain exhibits broad promoter selectivity, the BRCA1-dependent 5ZFC repression domain exhibits a more restricted promoter bias.

DISCUSSION

A central question regarding the role of BRCA1 in transcription control concerns the means by which it mediates gene-specific regulation in the absence of sequence-specific DNA binding activity. In part, this question has been answered by the identification of a growing number of sequence-specific DNA-binding transcription factors with which BRCA1 physically and functionally interacts. In this regard, our previous identification of ZBRK1 as a BRCA1-dependent transcriptional repressor provided a molecular basis to link BRCA1 directly to the regulation of *GADD45a* gene expression (39). Other work has rendered it clear that the BRCA1 regulation of *GADD45a* gene transcription is likely to be complex and mediated not only through ZBRK1 but other trans-acting factors, including OCT1 and NF-YA (21, 32, 39). Presently, however, little is known regarding the mechanism(s) by which BRCA1 mediates sequence-specific transcriptional control through the various transcription factors with which it interacts. Here we have investigated the functional interaction between ZBRK1 and BRCA1 in an effort to understand the role of BRCA1 in sequence-specific transcriptional repression.

Our studies suggest that BRCA1 mediates ZBRK1 repression, at least in part, through its targeted recruitment to a novel C-terminal repression domain (5ZFC) within ZBRK1. Structurally, this repression domain comprises the last four zinc fingers and the unique C-terminal extension of ZBRK1. The identification of 5ZFC as a discrete functional domain was revealed by its ability to repress transcription when tethered to a heterologous DNA-binding domain (Fig. 4) and its functional resistance to truncation or substitution mutagenesis (Fig. 6). Importantly, we demonstrated that 5ZFC repression function is dependent upon BRCA1; genetic ablation of *Brcal* or disruption of BRCA1-binding determinants on 5ZFC similarly abrogates the repression function of this domain (Figs. 5 and 6). The functional contribution of this domain to BRCA1-dependent ZBRK1 repression is reflected by our previous observation that deletion of the ZBRK1 C terminus abrogates ZBRK1 repression through natural ZBRK1-response elements (39). However, whereas BRCA1 binding is necessary, our studies here suggest that it is not sufficient for 5ZFC-directed repression. First, BRCA1 binding and repression determinants within this domain can be separated, suggesting a possible functional requirement for a co-repressor(s) in addition to BRCA1 (Figs. 3 and 6). Second, 5ZFC-directed repression is HDAC-dependent (Fig. 7). Thus, we propose that the ZBRK1 5ZFC repression domain recruits BRCA1 as part of a higher order repression complex that minimally includes an associated HDAC activity. Targeted attempts to identify the functionally relevant BRCA1-associated co-repressor activities are currently underway.

Our work further reveals unique insight into the structural and functional organization of ZBRK1, a member of the KRAB-ZFP family. The ~220 members of this family make up a significant proportion of the transcription factor complement of the human proteome and are believed to occupy important regulatory roles in development, differentiation, and transformation (41, 58–63). Despite their potential biological significance, our current understanding of the mechanisms through




FIG. 8. The ZBRK1 KRAB and 5ZFC repression domains exhibit unique promoter specificities. *A* and *B*, U2OS cells were transfected with 30 ng of pG₅TK-Luc, 15 ng pG₅SV40-Luc, or 90 ng pG₅SNRPN-Luc as indicated without or with the indicated nanogram amounts of GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC (*A*) or GAL4-ZBRK1 KRAB (*B*). Relative luciferase activities were calculated as described in the legend to Fig. 4. *C*, schematic representation of the GAL4-ZBRK1 KRAB and GAL4-ZBRK1 5ZFC chimeras, and the pG₅TK-Luc, pG₅SV40-Luc, and pG₅SNRPN-Luc reporter templates used in transfections.

which individual members of this protein family function is still rather limited. Thus, although considerable mechanistic insight into the repression function of the KRAB domain has been revealed in recent years (41–47), comparatively little is known regarding the role of KRAB domain-associated zinc fingers in transcriptional repression apart from their presumed role in sequence-specific DNA binding. In part, this gap in knowledge derives from the limited availability of KRAB-ZFP target sequences with which structure-function analyses may be carried out. In the case of several KRAB-ZFPs whose corresponding binding site sequences have been identified, an additional function(s) for individual zinc fingers beyond DNA binding seems implicit. For example, based on the observation that one C₂H₂ zinc finger can bind to ~3 bp of DNA (52–54), the established target sequence lengths of 5 and 27 bp, respectively, for the 8- and 10-fingered ZNF202 and KS1 proteins are incompatible with DNA contact mediated by every zinc finger (61, 63). Our previous derivation of a consensus binding sequence for ZBRK1 has permitted us here to dissect a long array KRAB-ZFP and examine the contribution of individual zinc fingers to both sequence-specific DNA-binding and transcriptional repression. Our studies reveal the ZBRK1 zinc fingers to be multifunctional in nature, with dedicated roles in binding DNA, BRCA1, or both.

First, zinc fingers 1–4 are essential for DNA binding activity and compose the minimal DNA-binding domain under moderate conditions of ionic strength (Fig. 1). Zinc finger 5 appears to be a critical and context-dependent DNA-binding zinc finger; this finger represents the extent of the minimal DNA-binding domain under more stringent conditions (Fig. 1). Zinc fingers 6

and 7 are not essential for DNA binding but nonetheless enhance the stability of DNA binding (Figs. 1 and 2). Finally, zinc finger 8 (along with the C terminus) is dispensable for, and may possibly destabilize, DNA binding mediated by zinc fingers 1–7 (Fig. 1). Taken together, these findings reveal the ZBRK1 zinc fingers to compose at least two functional classes: those that make minimal essential contacts with DNA (fingers 1–4) and those that modulate the stability of these contacts (fingers 5–8). Importantly, zinc fingers 5–8 that modulate ZBRK1 DNA binding activity also represent critical determinants of repression by DNA-bound ZBRK1 through association with co-repressors, including BRCA1. These findings thus extend the established role of KRAB-zinc fingers to include protein-protein interactions critical for transcriptional repression, and also identify within ZBRK1 dual specificity zinc fingers with twin roles in DNA-binding and transcriptional repression.

Our work advances the understanding of DNA recognition by KRAB-ZFPs in several respects. First, we provide further empirical evidence to support predictive models for C₂H₂ zinc finger-DNA recognition. Structural studies of 3- and 5-fingered proteins in complex with DNA have indicated that individual zinc fingers bind to ~3 bp of DNA (52–54). Based on this model, five of the eight ZBRK1 zinc fingers would be predicted to bind to its 15-bp recognition sequence. In fact, DNA-binding analyses revealed that under mild conditions of ionic strength, the first four ZBRK1 zinc fingers are sufficient to confer stable binding to its consensus sequence. However, more stringent conditions unmasked a requirement for the fifth finger, consistent with the aforementioned structural models. Second, our identification of ZBRK1 zinc finger 5 as a critical and context-

dependent DNA-binding determinant could clarify recent issues concerning selectivity among KRAB-ZFPs that recognize overlapping DNA-binding site sequences. In this regard, a four-fingered KRAB-ZFP called SZF1 was recently shown to recognize a DNA-binding site in common with ZBRK1 (64). The observation that SZF1 and ZBRK1 exhibit overlapping DNA-binding specificities *in vitro* raises the possibility that these proteins might compete for a common binding site(s) *in vivo* (64). This, in turn, could have significant implications for the biological regulation of target gene transcription by each of these proteins. However, as we show here, ZBRK1 zinc finger 5 is a critical DNA-binding determinant under more stringent conditions of increased ionic strength and also increased non-specific competitor concentrations *in vitro* (Fig. 1 and data not shown). Because these conditions are more likely to approximate those of the cellular milieu, in which target site location must be achieved in the presence of a vast excess of like and unlike DNA sequences, ZBRK1 zinc finger 5 could represent a critical determinant of target site selection *in vivo*. Beyond zinc finger 5, zinc fingers 6 and 7 through enhanced affinity and/or protein-protein interactions could further influence ZBRK1 target site selectivity.

Our identification within ZBRK1 of a C-terminal BRCA1-dependent repression domain in addition to the N-terminal KRAB domain represents the first demonstration of a KRAB-ZFP harboring two independent repression domains. More importantly, the presence of two inherent repression domains could have important implications for gene-specific transcription control by ZBRK1. As we show here, the KRAB and C-terminal repression domains within ZBRK1 can be distinguished functionally on the basis of their respective requirements for BRCA1; the C-terminal repression domain is BRCA1-dependent, whereas the KRAB domain is not. This functional distinction may in part underlie the unique promoter specificities of the two repression domains. Whereas the KRAB repression domain exhibits broad promoter specificity, the BRCA1-dependent repression domain exhibits a more restricted promoter bias. Thus, the relative contribution of the BRCA1-dependent repression domain to overall ZBRK1 repression may vary among different ZBRK1 target promoters, effectively expanding the regulatory potential available at ZBRK1 target genes. It will be of interest in future studies to determine whether and how these discrete repression domains function synergistically to confer ZBRK1 repression.

Finally, although our work suggests that BRCA1 mediates repression by DNA-bound ZBRK1, we cannot exclude the additional possibility that BRCA1 also mediates ZBRK1 repression, at least in part, by modulating its sequence-specific DNA binding activity. Our observation that the BRCA1-binding surface on ZBRK1 includes zinc fingers that modulate its DNA binding activity in both a positive (zinc finger 7) and negative (zinc finger 8) manner is consistent with this possibility, and studies are currently underway to address this important issue. Nonetheless the studies presented here shed new light on the functional organization of ZBRK1 as a model KRAB-ZFP and further define the role of BRCA1 in sequence-specific transcription control.

Acknowledgments—We thank our laboratory colleagues for advice and discussion and P. Renee Yew for insight and comments. We thank Drs. Y. Tony Ip (University of Massachusetts Medical School, Worcester, MA) and Paul A. Wade (Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA) for reporter plasmids.

REFERENCES

- Miki, Y., Swensen, J., Shattuck-Eidens, D., Futreal, P. A., Harshman, K., Tavtigian, S., Liu, Q., Cochran, C., Bennett, L. M., Ding, W., Bell, R., Rosenthal, J., Hussey, C., Tran, T., McClure, M., Frye, C., Hattier, T., Phelps, R., Haugen-Strano, A., Katcher, H., Yakumo, K., Gholami, Z., Shaffer, D., Stone, S., Bayer, S., Wray, C., Bogden, R., Dayananth, P., Ward, J., Tonin, P., Narod, S., Bristow, P. K., Norris, F. H., Helvering, L., Morrison, P., Rosteck, P., Lai, M., Barrett, J. C., Lewis, C., Neuhausen, S., Cannon-Albright, L., Goldgar, D., Wiseman, R., Kamb, A., and Skolnick, M. H. (1994) *Science* **266**, 66–71
- Hall, J. M., Lee, M. K., Newman, B., Morrow, J. E., Anderson, L. A., Huey, B., and King, M. C. (1990) *Science* **250**, 1684–1689
- Wooster, R., and Weber, B. L. (2003) *N. Engl. J. Med.* **348**, 2339–2347
- Tirkkonen, M., Johannsson, O., Agnarsson, B. A., Olsson, H., Ingvarsson, S., Karhu, R., Tanner, M., Isola, J., Barkardottir, R. B., Borg, A., and Kallioniemi, O. P. (1997) *Cancer Res.* **57**, 1222–1227
- Venkitaraman, A. R. (2002) *Cell* **108**, 171–182
- Zheng, L., Li, S., Boyer, T. G., and Lee, W. H. (2000) *Oncogene* **19**, 6159–6175
- Xu, X., Weaver, Z., Linke, S. P., Li, C., Gotay, J., Wang, X. W., Harris, C. C., Ried, T., and Deng, C. X. (1999) *Mol. Cell* **3**, 389–395
- Scully, R., and Livingston, D. M. (2000) *Nature* **408**, 429–432
- Welch, P. L., and King, M. C. (2001) *Hum. Mol. Genet.* **10**, 705–713
- Deng, C. X. (2001) *Mutat. Res.* **477**, 183–189
- Rosen, E. M., Fan, S., Pestell, R. G., and Goldberg, I. D. (2003) *J. Cell Physiol.* **196**, 19–41
- Xu, B., Kim, S., and Kastan, M. B. (2001) *Mol. Cell. Biol.* **21**, 3445–3450
- Cortez, D., Wang, Y., Qin, J., and Elledge, S. J. (1999) *Science* **286**, 1162–1166
- Lee, J. S., Collins, K. M., Brown, A. L., Lee, C. H., and Chung, J. H. (2000) *Nature* **404**, 201–204
- Scully, R., Chen, J., Ochs, R. L., Keegan, K., Hoekstra, M., Feunteun, J., and Livingston, D. M. (1997) *Cell* **90**, 425–435
- Li, S., Ting, N. S., Zheng, L., Chen, P. L., Ziv, Y., Shiloh, Y., Lee, E. Y., and Lee, W. H. (2000) *Nature* **406**, 210–215
- Moynahan, M. E., Chiu, J. W., Koller, B. H., and Jasin, M. (1999) *Mol. Cell* **4**, 511–518
- Zhong, Q., Chen, C. F., Li, S., Chen, Y., Wang, C. C., Xiao, J., Chen, P. L., Sharp, Z. D., and Lee, W. H. (1999) *Science* **285**, 747–750
- Scully, R., Chen, J., Plug, A., Xiao, Y., Weaver, D., Feunteun, J., Ashley, T., and Livingston, D. M. (1997) *Cell* **88**, 265–275
- Somasundaram, K., Zhang, H., Zeng, Y. X., Houvrás, Y., Peng, Y., Wu, G. S., Licht, J. D., Weber, B. L., and El-Deiry, W. S. (1997) *Nature* **389**, 187–190
- Harkin, D. P., Bean, J. M., Miklos, D., Song, Y. H., Truong, V. B., Englert, C., Christians, F. C., Ellisen, L. W., Maheswaran, S., Oliner, J. D., and Haber, D. A. (1999) *Cell* **97**, 575–586
- Deng, C. X., and Brodsky, S. G. (2000) *BioEssays* **22**, 728–737
- Monteiro, A. N. (2000) *Trends Biochem. Sci.* **25**, 469–474
- Starita, L. M., and Parvin, J. D. (2003) *Curr. Opin. Cell Biol.* **15**, 345–350
- Jasin, M. (2002) *Oncogene* **21**, 8981–8993
- Baer, R., and Ludwig, T. (2002) *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.* **12**, 86–91
- Bochar, D. A., Wang, L., Beniya, H., Kinev, A., Xue, Y., Lane, W. S., Wang, W., Kashanchi, F., and Shiekhattar, R. (2000) *Cell* **102**, 257–265
- Miyake, T., Hu, Y. F., Yu, D. S., and Li, R. (2000) *J. Biol. Chem.* **275**, 40169–40173
- MacLachlan, T. K., Somasundaram, K., Sgagias, M., Shifman, Y., Muschel, R. J., Cowan, K. H., and El-Deiry, W. S. (2000) *J. Biol. Chem.* **275**, 2777–2785
- Aprelikova, O., Pace, A. J., Fang, B., Koller, B. H., and Liu, E. T. (2001) *J. Biol. Chem.* **276**, 25647–25650
- Welch, P. L., Lee, M. K., Gonzalez-Hernandez, R. M., Black, D. J., Mahadevappa, M., Swisher, E. M., Warrington, J. A., and King, M. C. (2002) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **99**, 7560–7565
- Fan, W., Jin, S., Tong, T., Zhao, H., Fan, F., Antinore, M. J., Rajasekaran, B., Wu, M., and Zhan, Q. (2002) *J. Biol. Chem.* **277**, 8061–8067
- Ouchi, T., Monteiro, A. N., August, A., Aaronson, S. A., and Hanafusa, H. (1998) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **95**, 2302–2306
- Chai, Y. L., Cui, J., Shao, N., Shyam, E., Reddy, P., and Rao, V. N. (1999) *Oncogene* **18**, 263–268
- Fan, S., Ma, Y. X., Wang, C., Yuan, R. Q., Meng, Q., Wang, J. A., Erdos, M., Goldberg, I. D., Webb, P., Kushner, P. J., Pestell, R. G., and Rosen, E. M. (2001) *Oncogene* **20**, 77–87
- Park, J. J., Irvine, R. A., Buchanan, G., Koh, S. S., Park, J. M., Tilley, W. D., Stallcup, M. R., Press, M. F., and Coetzee, G. A. (2000) *Cancer Res.* **60**, 5946–5949
- Wang, Q., Zhang, H., Kajino, K., and Greene, M. I. (1998) *Oncogene* **17**, 1939–1948
- Zhang, H., Somasundaram, K., Peng, Y., Tian, H., Bi, D., Weber, B. L., and El-Deiry, W. S. (1998) *Oncogene* **16**, 1713–1721
- Zheng, L., Pan, H., Li, S., Flesken-Nikitin, A., Chen, P. L., Boyer, T. G., and Lee, W. H. (2000) *Mol. Cell* **6**, 757–768
- Zheng, L., Annab, L. A., Afshari, C. A., Lee, W. H., and Boyer, T. G. (2001) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **98**, 9587–9592
- Collins, T., Stone, J. R., and Williams, A. J. (2001) *Mol. Cell. Biol.* **21**, 3609–3615
- Friedman, J. R., Fredericks, W. J., Jensen, D. E., Speicher, D. W., Huang, X. P., Neilson, E. G., and Rauscher, F. J., III (1996) *Genes Dev.* **10**, 2067–2078
- Kim, S. S., Chen, Y. M., O'Leary, E., Witzgall, R., Vidal, M., and Bonventre, J. V. (1996) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **93**, 15299–15304
- Moosmann, P., Georgiev, O., Le Douarin, B., Bourquin, J. P., and Schaffner, W. (1996) *Nucleic Acids Res.* **24**, 4859–4867
- Lechner, M. S., Begg, G. E., Speicher, D. W., and Rauscher, F. J., III (2000) *Mol. Cell. Biol.* **20**, 6449–6465
- Schultz, D. C., Ayyanathan, K., Negorev, D., Maul, G. G., and Rauscher, F. J., III (2002) *Genes Dev.* **16**, 919–932
- Schultz, D. C., Friedman, J. R., and Rauscher, F. J., III (2001) *Genes Dev.* **15**, 428–443
- Kastan, M. B., Zhan, Q., El-Deiry, W. S., Carrier, F., Jacks, T., Walsh, W. V., Plunkett, B. S., Vogelstein, B., and Fornace, A. J., Jr. (1992) *Cell* **71**,

587–597

49. Hollander, M. C., Alamo, I., Jackman, J., Wang, M. G., McBride, O. W., and Fornace, A. J., Jr. (1993) *J. Biol. Chem.* **268**, 24385–24393
50. Sadowski, I., Bell, B., Broad, P., and Hollis, M. (1992) *Gene (Amst.)* **118**, 137–141
51. Fujita, N., Jaye, D. L., Kajita, M., Geigerman, C., Moreno, C. S., and Wade, P. A. (2003) *Cell* **113**, 207–219
52. Pavletich, N. P., and Pabo, C. O. (1991) *Science* **252**, 809–817
53. Pavletich, N. P., and Pabo, C. O. (1993) *Science* **261**, 1701–1707
54. Wolfe, S. A., Nekludova, L., and Pabo, C. O. (2000) *Annu. Rev. Biophys. Biomol. Struct.* **29**, 183–212
55. Del Rio, S., Menezes, S. R., and Setzer, D. R. (1993) *J. Mol. Biol.* **233**, 567–579
56. Del Rio, S., and Setzer, D. R. (1993) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **90**, 168–172
57. Yarden, R. I., and Brody, L. C. (1999) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **96**, 4983–4988
58. Jheon, A. H., Ganss, B., Cheifetz, S., and Sodek, J. (2001) *J. Biol. Chem.* **276**, 18282–18289
59. Bellefroid, E. J., Poncelet, D. A., Lecocq, P. J., Revelant, O., and Martial, J. A. (1991) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **88**, 3608–3612
60. Bellefroid, E. J., Marine, J. C., Ried, T., Lecocq, P. J., Riviere, M., Amemiya, C., Poncelet, D. A., Coulie, P. G., de Jong, P., Szipirer, C., Ward, D. C., and Martial, J. A. (1993) *EMBO J.* **12**, 1363–1374
61. Gebelein, B., and Urrutia, R. (2001) *Mol. Cell. Biol.* **21**, 928–939
62. Gebelein, B., Fernandez-Zapico, M., Imoto, M., and Urrutia, R. (1998) *J. Clin. Investig.* **102**, 1911–1919
63. Wagner, S., Hess, M. A., Ormonde-Hanson, P., Malandro, J., Hu, H., Chen, M., Kehler, R., Frodsham, M., Schumacher, C., Beluch, M., Honer, C., Skolnick, M., Ballinger, D., and Bowen, B. R. (2000) *J. Biol. Chem.* **275**, 15685–15690
64. Peng, H., Zheng, L., Lee, W. H., Rux, J. J., and Rauscher, F. J., III (2002) *Cancer Res.* **62**, 3773–3781

BRCA1 and BRCA2 in breast cancer

Wen-Hwa Lee, Thomas G Boyer

The inheritance of an autosomal dominant allele represents an identifiable predisposing factor in about 10% of all women with breast cancer. Most of these hereditary cases can be linked to germline mutations in either of two breast cancer susceptibility genes, *BRCA1* or *BRCA2*. Women who have a mutation in either of these genes have a cumulative lifetime risk of 60–80% and 20–40% for the development of breast and ovarian cancer, respectively. There is therefore a great need for new and effective measures for their management. Progress in our understanding of the normal biological function and regulation of *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* has shed new light on the molecular basis of hereditary breast cancer, and should provide a driving force for the development of diagnostic and therapeutic strategies.

BRCA1 and *BRCA2* are caretaker genes whose products function in the maintenance of global genome stability—ie, they ensure that the genetic integrity of a cell is not compromised by the unscheduled loss, duplication, or rearrangement of chromosomal DNA. A persistent threat to genome integrity is DNA damage arising from ongoing metabolic processes within the cell, as well as that elicited by extrinsic agents, including radiation and certain chemicals. Unrepaired or misrepaired DNA damage can compromise chromosomal stability, allowing a cell to escape normal restrictions on its growth.

Genome integrity is ensured in part by a response system that has evolved to locate and effect the timely repair of damage to DNA. This response involves the assembly of DNA-repair protein complexes able to recognise and eliminate damage-induced lesions, and the synthesis of cell-cycle checkpoint control proteins that provide a sufficient window of opportunity to effect such repair. *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* occupy fundamental roles in coupling DNA damage-induced signals to downstream cellular responses, including damage repair and cell-cycle checkpoint activation.


Because the DNA damage-induced signalling pathways that converge on *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* are universally conserved, the genes are likely to function ubiquitously in

the maintenance of genome integrity. Nonetheless, inactivation of *BRCA1* or *BRCA2* generally leads only to cancer of the breast or ovary. What then might constitute the molecular basis for the tissue-specific tumour suppressive properties of *BRCA1* and *BRCA2*?

The breast and the ovary are reproductive organs that rely on hormones, including oestrogen and progesterone, for growth, differentiation, and homeostasis. According to one theory, inactivation of *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* renders breast and ovary susceptible to tissue-specific effects of oestrogen-induced DNA damage. Thus, inactivating mutations in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* could compromise the response of breast and ovarian epithelial cells to oestrogen-induced DNA damage, thereby resulting in inefficient or error-prone DNA repair. Global genomic instability and a concomitant accrual of functionally inactivating mutations within other genes involved in breast and ovarian tumourigenesis might then ensue. Alternatively, *BRCA1* might modulate hormone signalling pathways and control of cellular proliferation. *BRCA1* represses the transcriptional activity of the oestrogen and progesterone receptors, and mutational inactivation of the gene could, therefore, promote epithelial cell proliferation through altered expression of hormone-responsive genes.

These two models are not mutually exclusive and could suggest a combinatorial path to breast cancer, since they invoke *BRCA1*-mediated and *BRCA2*-mediated control at two distinct steps of tumourigenesis—initiation and progression. Thus, inappropriate expression of hormone-responsive genes could promote the proliferation of transformed cells arising through inefficient or error-prone repair of oestrogen-induced DNA damage. In this way, hereditary *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutations could render breast and ovarian epithelial cells particularly susceptible to tumourigenesis through perturbation of distinct hormone-dependent pathways (figure).

This knowledge could help to treat those carrying mutations in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2*, and might also be useful in the treatment of patients with sporadic, non-genetic breast cancers. Few mutations in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* arise in sporadic breast cancers, suggesting that the perturbation of alternative pathways causes malignant disease in these cases. As caretakers of genomic integrity, *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* represent prime targets for therapeutic intervention—ie, targeted inactivation of *BRCA1*-specific and *BRCA2*-specific DNA-damage response pathways could render tumour cells sensitive to the genotoxic effects of radiation or chemotherapeutic agents, thereby offering the potential for improved combination therapies. In the last decade of the 20th century, *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* were identified and characterised. The role and regulation of their encoded products in DNA-damage response and repair, once identified, should expedite the design and implementation of strategies to delay, and ultimately to prevent, tumour formation.



Role of *BRCA* genes in breast cancer
E₂=oestrogen.



Wen-Hwa Lee (photo) is the Alice P McDermott Distinguished University Chair of the Department of Molecular Medicine. Thomas G Boyer is an assistant professor in the Department of Molecular Medicine where he studies mechanisms of transcription control. Department of Molecular Medicine, Institute of Biotechnology, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, 15355 Lambda Drive, San Antonio, TX 78245, USA (Prof W-H Lee PhD, T H Boyer PhD) boyer@uthscsa.edu

Appendix 6

Breast Cancer Susceptibility Genes

by Thomas G. Boyer and Wen-Hwa Lee

The last decade of the 20th century witnessed the identification and initial characterization of two major breast cancer susceptibility genes, *BRCA-1* and *BRCA-2*. Studies of the encoded *BRCA* proteins have revealed roles in the maintenance of chromosomal stability and in DNA damage response and repair, and studies continue to illuminate further biological activities. A greater appreciation of the involvement of *BRCA-1* and *2* in breast and ovary cells will increase the probability that recent advances in our understanding of their biological functions will be channeled effectively to the treatment and prevention of breast and ovarian cancer.


In the year 2002, approximately 200,000 American women will be diagnosed with breast cancer, the most common malignancy afflicting women in the United States. Among women who do not smoke, breast cancer is the primary cause of cancer-related death.


Although many factors influence a woman's lifetime risk for development of breast cancer, family history is one of the most powerful prognostic indicators. About 10% of all breast cancer cases can be linked to heritable transmission of an autosomal dominant allele. Thus a major achievement was substantiation that many of these hereditary cases could be linked to germline mutations in either of two breast cancer susceptibility genes, identified as *BRCA-1* and *2*.

Through linkage analysis of families affected by early-onset breast and ovarian cancer, *BRCA-1* was mapped to chromosome 17q21 in 1990 and cloned 4 years later. *BRCA-2* was mapped to chromosome 13q and cloned shortly thereafter. Mutations in *BRCA-1* are believed to account for 60 to 80% of hereditary breast and ovarian cancer cases and up to 20% of hereditary breast cancers only. *BRCA-2* mutations are linked to a similar percentage of inherited breast cancers, but in contrast to *BRCA-1*, they also predispose to male breast cancer.

Together, defects in these two genes account for about 40% of inherited breast cancers. Germline inactivation of one allele of either *BRCA-1* or *2* is sufficient to predis-

Mutations in *BRCA* genes account for almost half of hereditary breast cancers. The rest derive from mutations either in identified genes associated with rare cancer susceptibility syndromes or in unidentified susceptibility genes.





pose a person to cancer, while cancer onset is invariably accompanied by loss of the remaining allele. Thus *BRCA-1* and 2 belong to the group of tumor susceptibility genes whose encoded products normally function to suppress tumor formation.

Mutations in other known tumor susceptibility genes, such as *p53*, the retinoblastoma gene *RB*, and the adenomatous polyposis gene *APC*, are found in both familial and sporadic tumors. Mutations in *BRCA-1* and 2, however, are rarely detected in nonhereditary breast cancers, though it has been proposed that aberrant regulation of their expression or of the activity of their products could contribute to sporadic breast cancers.

Clearly, detailed knowledge of the normal biological functions of these proteins and of their regulation will be required for a thorough appreciation of how direct or indirect functional inactivation of *BRCA-1* and 2 leads ultimately to breast cancer. In this article, we begin with a description of the structural features of the BRCA proteins and then highlight recent insights into their biological role and regulation.

Protein Structures Are Clues to Functions

BRCA-1 is a nuclear phosphoprotein of 1863 amino acids characterized by the presence of a notable structural motif near each end.

At its amino terminus, *BRCA-1* harbors a zinc-binding RING finger domain, which is a set of spatially conserved cysteine and histidine residues. More than 200 RING finger proteins of diverse function are potentially encoded by the human genome, so this domain is a relatively common structural motif. Recent studies have raised the possibility that the functional diversity apparent among RING finger proteins is tied to a common enzymatic activity.

The carboxy terminal of *BRCA-1* includes a series of domains that are autonomous folding units defined by conserved clusters of hydrophobic amino acids. These are called *BRCA-1* C-terminal or BRCT domains, and they have been found in other proteins implicated in DNA repair and cell cycle checkpoint control. No specific cellular function has so far been ascribed to the BRCT domain, but it is likely to be a protein interaction surface.


A third region in *BRCA-1* also appears to be a functionally relevant protein interaction surface, but the structure of this region has not yet been defined. The same region includes two putative nuclear localization signals.

BRCA-2 is a nuclear protein of 3418 amino acids whose most prominent feature is eight tandem copies of a repetitive sequence termed the BRC repeat. Also notable is a region of about 500

Structural and functional domains of *BRCA-1* and 2 are named above each of the schematic proteins. Representative proteins that interact with *BRCA-1* and 2 are identified beneath them.

THOMAS G. BOYER
and **WEN-HWA LEE**
are in the Department of Molecular Medicine and Institute of Biotechnology, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio.

BRCA-1 and 2 couple signals of DNA damage to cellular responses, including damage repair and cell cycle checkpoint activities. Though much about this process is not yet understood, it is known that BRCA-1 is phosphorylated by any of several protein kinases, depending on the type of DNA damage. Both BRCA proteins interact physically with DNA repair proteins, and BRCA-1 also participates in transcription control of genes that encode DNA repair and cell cycle checkpoint control proteins.



amino acids that is more highly conserved between human and mouse than the coding sequence as a whole.

BRCA-1 and 2 Are Caretakers of Genomic Stability

Insights into the biological functions of BRCA-1 and 2 have come from analyses of cells derived from BRCA-mutant human breast tumors and from embryos of mice carrying targeted deletions of the *BRCA* genes. Invariably, BRCA-deficient cells exhibit gross chromosomal abnormalities, typified by breaks, aberrant mitotic exchanges, and aneuploidy.


These sorts of DNA damage arising from ongoing metabolic processes within the cell or caused by extrinsic agents, including radiation and certain chemicals, are a persistent threat to genome integrity. A response system has evolved to locate damaged DNA and effect its timely repair. BRCA-

1 and 2 are parts of that system, cellular caretakers ensuring that the genetic integrity of a cell is not compromised by the unscheduled loss, duplication, or rearrangement of chromosomal DNA.

The DNA repair response involves the assembly of protein complexes capable of recognizing and eliminating damage-induced lesions, as well as the synthesis of proteins that arrest cell cycle progression while the damage is repaired. Disruption of the damage response system can lead to replication or segregation of damaged chromosomal DNA, and that in turn can permit a cell to escape normal restrictions on its growth, which is practically the definition of cancer.

Evidence to implicate BRCA-1 and 2 in the DNA damage response has come from the observation that cells deficient in either protein are hypersensitive to a variety of DNA-damaging agents. A more specific function was suggested by the finding that cells

Discovery of the BRCA genes and early work on their protein products was described by Barbara Weber in the January/February 1996 issue of SCIENCE & MEDICINE.



deficient in either BRCA-1 or 2 exhibited overt defects in the repair of oxidative DNA damage. Further studies have documented direct interactions between BRCA-1 or BRCA-2 and individual protein components of the DNA repair machinery.

BRCA-1 has been linked to DNA repair through its interaction with a complex of three proteins, RAD-50/MRE-11/NBS-1, that operates in both nonhomologous and homologous recombinational repair of double-strand breaks. The three-protein complex has been proposed to resect DNA ends at the sites of double-strand breaks in order to reveal sequence homologies through which recombination can ensue. What BRCA-1 does in its association with this complex remains to be established.

BRCA-1 is also a resident component of a large multiprotein complex that includes mismatch repair proteins. These and other proteins are involved in replication or in repair of DNA damage that can occur at replication forks. The association of BRCA-1 with these proteins suggests that it participates in resolving aberrant DNA structures that appear during replication or when replication is stalled.

A role for BRCA-2 in DNA damage repair has been suggested by the discovery that it interacts with a recombinase called, in mammals, RAD-51. Mammalian RAD-51 is a homologue of the prokaryotic RecA and yeast Rad51p proteins, the latter a member of the RAD-52 epistasis group. In yeast, RAD-52 epistasis proteins are required for repair of DNA double-strand breaks as well as mitotic and meiotic recombination.

Eukaryotic RAD-51 proteins, like RecA, have intrinsic ATP-dependent DNA binding activity. RAD-51 and single-strand DNA form a nucleoprotein filament that invades and pairs with a homologous DNA duplex, catalyzing homologous DNA pairing and strand exchange. Mouse embryos lacking BRCA-2 exhibit radiation hypersensitivity defects like those seen in mouse embryos lacking RAD-51.


The interaction between BRCA-2 and RAD-51 involves the BRC repeats in BRCA-2. Peptides corresponding to individual BRC repeats can inhibit multimerization of RAD-51 and block nucleoprotein filament formation. Whether this inhibitory activity is a physiological role for BRCA-2 in regulating RAD-51 activity has not been established.

DNA double-strand breaks induced for example by ionizing radiation are repaired by two processes in which the BRCA proteins are involved. In a complex with RAD-50, MRE-11, NBS-1, and other proteins, BRCA-1 takes part in both homologous recombination and nonhomologous end-joining. BRCA-2 complexed with RAD-51 is active in strand exchange during homologous recombination.

AUTHOR--

In your original drawing, there is an up-arrow just to the right of the DNA below BRCA-1 (above cell cycle). What does this mean, and should it be reinstated?

With associated co-repressor CtIP, BRCA-1 ordinarily represses transcription of cell cycle checkpoint control genes. In response to certain kinds of DNA damage, BRCA-1 and CtIP are phosphorylated by ATM. Phosphorylated CtIP dissociates from BRCA-1, leading to relief of BRCA-1-mediated transcriptional repression and consequent induction of *p21* and *GADD-45*. The protein products of those genes function in G₁-S and G₂-M cell cycle arrest, respectively.



Consistent with that possibility, though, is the observation that formation of RAD-51 protein complexes, normally induced by DNA damage, is diminished in cells either deficient in BRCA-2 or in which the interaction between BRCA-2 and RAD-51 is specifically disrupted. It therefore seems clear that BRCA-2 is necessary for the assembly of RAD-51 complexes.


Processes of DNA repair must be coordinated with regulation of cell cycle transit so that damage is repaired before chromosomal DNA is replicated or segregated. There is considerable evidence that BRCA-1 occupies a central place in activation of cell cycle checkpoints when DNA damage is detected.

First, BRCA-1-mutant cells exhibit defects in DNA damage-induced S and G₂-M cell cycle checkpoints. Second, after DNA damage, BRCA-1 is rapidly phos-

phorylated by cell cycle checkpoint kinases, suggesting that it functions downstream of DNA damage sensors that trigger cell cycle checkpoints. And third, BRCA-1 has been shown to regulate expression of cell cycle checkpoint control genes, including *p21* and *GADD-45*, which function in G₁-S and G₂-M cell cycle checkpoints, respectively.

The role of BRCA-2 in cell cycle checkpoint control is much less clear. Where examined, DNA damage-induced cell cycle checkpoints appear to be largely intact in cells lacking wild-type BRCA-2. Indirect evidence exists to link BRCA-2 to G₂-M control, but it is not entirely clear whether this is an indirect effect secondary to the role of BRCA-2 in DNA damage repair.

The fact that specific disruption of the interaction between BRCA-2 and RAD-51 leads to loss of G₂-M checkpoint control suggests that this may be the case. Thus, BRCA-



2 inactivation could trigger existing checkpoints that monitor DNA structure, leading to delays in G₂-M progression.

Collectively, the phenotypic characteristics of cells deficient in *BRCA-1* or *2* suggest that these proteins are fundamental in the DNA damage response by participating in damage repair, cell cycle checkpoint control, or both.

Chromosomal instability arising from a defective DNA damage repair response has been proposed as the pathogenic basis for tumorigenesis accompanying *BRCA* deficiency. Paradoxically, chromosomal instability should lead to cell growth arrest or increased cell death, so the question is how *BRCA-1* or *2* mutations might lead to the opposite effect.

One answer might lie in the observation that tumor cells deficient in *BRCA-1* or *2* frequently harbor other inactivating mutations in cell cycle checkpoint control genes, including *p53*. Those mutations may circumvent the growth arrest that is normally induced by DNA damage and also inhibit *p53*-mediated apoptosis, permitting the survival of cells despite severe chromosomal damage.

On the other hand, inactivation of mitotic checkpoint genes could bypass mitotic arrest and permit aberrant chromosomes to segregate into progeny cells. This model is supported by experimental observations and suggests that the genetic instability arising in *BRCA-1*- or *2*-deficient cells is pivotal in tumorigenesis, leading first to compensatory gene mutations that override damage-induced cell cycle arrest and apoptosis and subsequently to the accrual of functionally inactivating mutations of genetic loci involved in breast tumorigenesis.

BRCA-1 and 2 Regulate Cell Growth and Differentiation

Emerging evidence suggests important roles for *BRCA-1* and *2* in the control of cell growth and differentiation. The clearest example is the observation that homozygous deletion of *Brca-1* in mice results in early embryonic lethality accompanied by developmental retardation and cellular proliferation defects.

This outcome can be explained in part by the involvement of *BRCA-1* and *2* in DNA repair,

Possible pathways to breast cancer in women carrying germline mutations in *BRCA-1* or *2*.

Somatic inactivation of the remaining allele gives rise to repair-deficient cells. Most of these cells ultimately die because of cumulative DNA damage and activation of cell cycle checkpoints. Rare repair-deficient cells (*green cells*) that survive can acquire additional mutations in cell cycle checkpoint control genes. These cells can survive in spite of genomic instability and give rise to tumors.

Alternatively, mutational inactivation of a cell cycle checkpoint gene may precede somatic inactivation of the remaining *BRCA* allele, resulting in repair deficient cells that can survive despite genomic instability. The result is the same.

Author -- Were confused by the meaning of the colors in the above figure. We will revised the above figure as needed.

Author--

Please differentiate *BRCA* vs *BRCA* vs *Brca* for me. My understanding is that the first is the gene (ital), then protein (no italic), so I don't understand what *Brca* (both italic and non-italic) represents.

Author--

See figure on opposite page: in your original drawing for activation, you included an arrow pointing to the "bend" in the DNA; in fact, damage should occur at TATA, which in your drawing is covered by the BRCA complex -- is this correct? Do we need to move the BRCA molecules to cover TATA or re-insert the arrow?

because targeted deletions in *p53* or its downstream effector *p21* can rescue embryos with homozygous *Brca-1* and 2 deficiency. Thus, cumulative DNA damage arising in the absence of *Brca-1* and 2 has been hypothesized to trigger *p53*-mediated cell cycle arrest and apoptosis in the developing embryo, while inactivation of *p53* leads to cell cycle checkpoint bypass and survival.

However, inactivation of *p53* only partially rescues these embryos, which survive for only days longer in development. While the delayed embryonic lethality accompanying inactivation of *p53* has been ascribed to the accumulation of gross chromosomal defects that are incompatible with life, the possibility also exists that *Brca-1* and 2 are required for transit through a critical point later in embryonic development.

Another line of evidence has come from studies of transgenic mice carrying a *Brca-1* allele that can be targeted for conditional inactivation specifically in the mammary glands of female mice. That inactivation elicits defects in ductal morphogenesis and also induces tumors that are associated with genetic instability, aneuploidy, and chromosomal rearrangements.

In addition to independently supporting a role for *BRCA-1* as a breast tumor suppressor, this mouse model has revealed that *BRCA-1* is critical in mammary epithelial development. Conditional inactivation of *BRCA-2* specifically in mammary gland has yet to be achieved, so the role of *BRCA-2* in mammary gland formation remains to be established.

BRCA-1 and 2 Regulate Transcription

In parallel with the genetic studies, biochemical and molecular biological analyses have been carried out to determine how *BRCA-1* and 2 execute their functions. The proteins have been linked to a variety of biological activities.


Involvement of *BRCA-1* in transcriptional regulation was initially indicated by the identification near its carboxyl terminus of an acidic domain with an inherent trans-activation function that is sensitive to cancer-predisposing mutations. This region interacts directly or indirectly with a variety of transcriptional co-activators, including the histone acetyltransferase *p300* and *hBRG-1*, which is the catalytic subunit of a chromatin-remodeling complex called *SW-1/SNF*.

The same region, interestingly, also interacts with transcriptional co-repressors, including histone deacetylases and the *CtIP/CtBP* protein complex. *BRCA-1* mutations found in familial breast cancer compromise the trans-activation function but also abolish the binding of *BRCA-1* to co-repressors. These observations have prompted the speculation that *BRCA-1* may function like a nuclear receptor, either activating or repressing transcription depending on associated co-factors.

Gene expression profiling methods have disclosed that ectopic overexpression of *BRCA-1* can induce or repress many genes implicated in cell cycle control, cell cycle regulation, and DNA replication and repair. By virtue of this transcriptional regulatory activity, *BRCA-1* could influence cellular responses downstream of DNA damage signals, including DNA repair and cell cycle checkpoint activation.

BRCA-1-mediated regulation of *GADD-45* transcription illustrates how *BRCA-1* might participate in cell cycle checkpoint control and also provides a model for how *BRCA-1* can achieve gene-specific transcriptional regulation. *GADD-45* is a tumor suppressor gene induced by DNA damage. Its encoded product functions in *G₂-M* cell cycle checkpoint control.

Induction of *GADD-45* transcription in response to ultraviolet radiation and radiomimetic agents has been shown to depend on *BRCA-1*, and evidence exists to



suggest that the same may be true for ionizing radiation. It is also known that BRCA-1 interacts with a co-repressor, CtIP, to repress transcription of *GADD-45* and that this interaction is disrupted by DNA damage.

Neither BRCA-1 nor CtIP can bind DNA in a sequence-specific manner, however, so how these proteins are recruited to their target genes was an unresolved question. The answer was recently provided by identification of an intervening protein, named ZBRK-1, that binds to both BRCA-1 and a specific DNA sequence element present in a subset of BRCA-1's target genes, including *GADD-45*.

In this way, BRCA-1 can be physically tethered and functionally linked to specific regulatory loci. It is ZBRK-1 that actually represses transcription when it is bound to BRCA-1, so that BRCA-1 itself is a co-repressor. Potential ZBRK-1 binding sites have been identified in a large group of genes inducible

by DNA damage, so the ZBRK-1/BRCA-1 complex may be a global regulator of DNA damage-responsive genes.

A model has been proposed whereby ZBRK-1, BRCA-1, and CtIP coordinately repress a functionally diverse group of DNA damage-response genes in the absence of genotoxic insult, and that phosphorylation induced by DNA damage disrupts the network of interactions among these proteins, de-repressing transcription.

It must be emphasized that de-repression as an operative mechanism in transcriptional control of *GADD-45* and other inducible genes in vivo is likely to be coordinated with other mechanisms of gene activation. BRCA-1 has been reported to interact functionally with a variety of sequence-specific DNA-binding transcriptional activators, including the tumor suppressor p53.

Model for sequence-specific transcription control by BRCA-1 through its dual role as a co-repressor and a co-activator.

ZBRK-1 is a transcriptional repressor that recruits BRCA-1 to its specific DNA binding sites in target genes, one of which is in intron 3 of *GADD-45*. BRCA-1 may then (1) recruit CtIP and CtBP to reorganize higher chromatin structure, (2) recruit histone deacetylase complexes to effect local gene silencing, or (3) interact with the basal transcription machinery.

In response to an appropriate DNA damage signal, BRCA-1-mediated repression of *GADD-45* transcription is relieved. That permits BRCA-1 to become a co-activator of, for example, p53, which also binds to intron 3 of *GADD-45*. BRCA-1 could mediate transcriptional activation by either (1) recruiting chromatin-modifying activities to facilitate transcription complex assembly at the promoter or (2) directly recruiting the RNA polymerase II holoenzyme to the promoter. In this model, damage-induced transcription of *GADD-45* results from concerted de-repression and activation.

Author--

Can you provide a background paragraph or two on ubiquitination and protein destruction (see underlined paragraph). Our readers aren't (all) cell biologists and would benefit from additional explanation. This can be inserted into the running text before or after underlined text or shown as a sidebar.

In this regard, p53 appears to be an important link between BRCA-1 and transcriptional activation of DNA damage-inducible genes. It lies at the heart of a cell-signaling pathway that is triggered by genotoxic stresses, including DNA damage. Stress-induced p53-initiated cell cycle arrest or apoptosis ensures the timely repair or elimination of potentially deleterious genetic lesions.

Significantly, p53 and BRCA-1 appear to regulate transcription of an overlapping set of DNA damage-inducible target genes, including *GADD-45*. This observation initially implied a functional interaction between these two important tumor suppressors, a prediction that has since been borne out experimentally.

BRCA-1 and p53 have been demonstrated to interact physically and to synergize functionally to activate transcription through a p53-binding site in a *GADD-45* intron. The ability of BRCA-1 to potentiate p53-dependent transcription without itself binding to DNA has led to the hypothesis that BRCA-1 functions as a p53-specific co-activator, possibly linking the biochemical activities of these two proteins to a common pathway of tumor suppression.

By being both a co-repressor and a co-activator of gene transcription, BRCA-1 appears to function as a link between parallel and perhaps synergistic pathways that lead to induction of DNA damage repair effectors. Before it can be understood how BRCA-1 integrates these dual functions, it will be necessary to decipher the mechanistic basis for its independent activation and repression.

In contrast to BRCA-1, the part that BRCA-2 plays in transcriptional regulation is far less certain. Some evidence implicates BRCA-2 in transcription control, including, again, an inherent trans-activation function within the gene that is sensitive to cancer-predisposing mutations and an association with established transcriptional co-fac-


tors and histone acetyltransferases. However, the biological significance of these findings has not been demonstrated.

Most if not all of the cellular pool of BRCA-1 resides in stable complexes with other proteins, so one possibility is that BRCA-1 is a molecular scaffold that facilitates assembly of multi-protein machines. Alternatively, the documented association of BRCA-1 with activities that modify chromatin could point to pleiotropic roles in DNA repair and gene transcription. BRCA-1 could variously promote or disrupt nucleosome-mediated condensation of DNA at gene promoters or DNA damage sites, thus precluding or facilitating access by transcription and repair factors, respectively.

Recent work has uncovered a ubiquitin ligase activity of BRCA-1, which raises the intriguing possibility that the protein's multiple functions could all derive from an ability to selectively mark proteins for destruction. Specifically, BRCA-1 interacts with another RING finger protein named BARD-1 through the respective RING domains of each protein. A heterodimeric complex formed by the isolated RING domains of the two proteins exhibits ubiquitin ligase activity in vitro.

Significantly, cancer-related missense mutations within the BRCA-1 RING finger abrogate this activity, suggesting that ubiquitin ligase activity may be important for the biological function of BRCA-1 in breast and ovarian tumor suppression. Presently, no physiological substrates of BRCA-1/BARD-1-targeted ubiquitination have been identified. But if BRCA-1 is involved in targeting proteins for ubiquitination, its participation in a wide range of cellular processes could be explained to some extent.

BARD-1 also interacts with a polyadenylation factor, CstF-50, which indirectly links BRCA-1 to RNA processing. Whether and how the ubiquitin ligase activity of



BRCA-1 alone or in association with BARD-1 contributes to the functions of BRCA-1 is an important area for future investigation.

Tumor Susceptibility Is Tissue-Specific

DNA damage response pathways that converge on BRCA-1 and 2 are conserved across many cell types, so that BRCA-1 and 2 are likely to function widely in the maintenance of genomic integrity. Nonetheless, mutational inactivation of these genes leads principally to cancer of the breast and ovary. Why?

As reproductive organs, breast and ovary rely on hormones for growth and differentiation. At least two hypotheses invoking the action of hormones have been proposed to explain the tissue-restricted tumor suppressor functions of BRCA-1 and 2. According to one model, mutational inactivation of the *BRCA* genes renders breast susceptible to the tissue-specific effects of estrogen-induced DNA damage. A major oxidative metabolite of estrogen, 4-hydroxyestradiol, is genotoxic.

The suggestion is that inactivat-

ing mutations in *BRCA-1* or 2 could compromise the response of breast epithelial cells in particular to estrogen-induced DNA damage. Inefficient or error-prone DNA repair could then lead to genomic instability and a concomitant accrual of functionally inactivating mutations within other genes involved in breast tumorigenesis. Put another way, *BRCA-1* and 2 mutations might enhance the probability of tumor formation arising from estrogen-induced DNA damage.


A second model proposes that BRCA-1 and 2 modulate hormone signaling pathways that induce cell proliferation. BRCA-1 has been shown to repress the transcriptional activity of the estrogen receptor (ER- α), so mutational inactivation of BRCA-1 could promote epithelial cell proliferation by altering expression of hormone-responsive genes.

The two models are not mutually exclusive and could suggest a combinatorial path to breast cancer, with BRCA-1-mediated control operating at two distinct steps in tumorigenesis, initiation and progression.

Ubiquitin is a marker that tags other proteins for destruction. The sequence of events is shown here schematically.

A ubiquitin-activating enzyme E1 (UBA) is charged with ubiquitin, which is then transferred to a ubiquitin-conjugating enzyme E2 (UBC). A ubiquitin ligase E3 presumably functions as a platform for recruitment of both the E2 enzyme and a substrate protein, which is polyubiquitinated and thereby targeted for destruction.

A heterodimer formed by isolated RING domains of BRCA-1 and BARD-1 can function as an E3 ubiquitin ligase in vitro. Remaining surfaces on the two proteins could be involved in substrate recruitment in vivo. The structure of the heterodimer formed by the RING domains has been described.



BRCA-1 is a barrier to transcription of genes that are targets of the estrogen receptor (ER), preventing cell proliferation by repressing unliganded ER bound to the estrogen response element (ERE). BRCA-1-mediated ER suppression additionally involves one or more co-repressors, minimally including a histone deacetylase activity.

In cells deficient in BRCA-1, ERE-bound ER is free to promote transcription of its target genes and cell proliferation independent of estrogen. Such transcription derives from recruitment of co-activators.

Models explaining how BRCA-1 acts through modulation of estrogen receptor function must account for the clinical observation that a significant proportion of BRCA-1-associated breast cancers are negative for ER- α expression. A definitive understanding of this phenomenon is precluded by the fact that it simply is not known how "ER-negative" tumors arise.

It has recently been shown that within the terminal ductal lobular unit, where breast cancers are believed to originate, there are at least three distinct epithelial cell populations: ER- α -positive cells that do not proliferate, ER- α -negative cells that do proliferate, and a small number of ER- α -positive cells that can proliferate as well.

Again, there are two principal models for the genesis of ER- α -negative epithelial-derived tumors, both of which are compatible with a role for BRCA-1 in the control of epithelial cell proliferation through functional interaction with ER- α .

In one model, ER- α -negative breast cancers arise from the loss of ER- α expression during the clinical evolution of cancers that were originally ER- α -positive. In this


case, it is possible that the loss of ER- α expression is a relatively late event in breast tumor progression, one that may occur after any proliferative advantages conferred upon transformation-initiated cells by homozygous BRCA-1 mutation have ensued.

Alternatively, it has been proposed that ER- α -negative and ER- α -positive tumors are distinct entities that reflect the receptor status of their clonal origins. Recent data suggest a model in which proliferation of ER- α -negative cells is controlled by paracrine growth factors released from ER- α -positive cells in an estrogen-dependent manner. Here, mutational inactivation of BRCA-1 could promote growth factor-mediated proliferation of ER- α -negative tumors.

Finally, discovery of a second estrogen receptor subtype, ER- β , raises the possibility that this receptor mediates the proliferative response to estrogen in cells that are negative for ER- α expression. ER- β is expressed during the immortalization and transformation of ER- α -negative human breast epithelial cells *in vitro*.

The functional role of ER- β -mediated estrogen signaling path-

George Kuiper and colleagues discussed the two types of estrogen receptors in the July/August 1998 issue of SCIENCE & MEDICINE.



Role of the BRCA proteins in breast cancer. In normal breast epithelial cells, BRCA-1 and 2 ensure efficient DNA repair, thereby preserving genomic integrity in the face of genotoxic insult, including the action of estrogen metabolites. In addition, BRCA-1 restricts estrogen-independent expression of estrogen-responsive genes by directly inhibiting the unliganded estrogen receptor, thus rendering cells dependent on estrogen for growth. BRCA-deficient breast epithelial cells can develop unstable genomes through inefficient repair of damaged DNA and can become independent of estrogen for growth.

ways in the pathogenesis of breast cancer is currently unknown. However, the possibility exists that ER- β may also be subject to BRCA-1-mediated repression.

How might the knowledge now at hand concerning the biological functions of BRCA-1 and 2 be exploited to clinical advantage? For women genetically predisposed to *BRCA-1* and 2 mutations, restricted exposure to direct or indirect extrinsic sources of DNA damage might be warranted.

In reality, knowledge about BRCA-1 and 2 function might find its most useful applications in the treatment of the 90% of sporadic breast cancers for which no genetic linkage with an identifiable susceptibility locus can be found. In these sporadic cancers, perturbation of other pathways are likely involved in tumorigenesis. Nonetheless, as caretaker genes, BRCA-1 and 2 represent prime targets for

therapeutic intervention.

For example, targeted inactivation of BRCA-1 and 2-specific DNA damage response pathways could render tumor cells particularly sensitive to the genotoxic effects of radiation or chemotherapeutic agents, offering the potential for improved combination therapies.

Author--

Please list 2 or 3 good recent reviews and a similar number of key primary papers. [the ones below do not need to be kept]

RECENT REVIEWS

Ashok R. Venkitaraman: Cancer susceptibility and the functions of BRCA-1 and BRCA-2. *Cell* 108:171-182, January 25, 2002.

Lei Zheng, Shang Li, Thomas G. Boyer, and Wen-Hwa Lee: Lessons learned from BRCA-1 and BRCA-2. *Oncogene* 19:6159-6175, December 11, 2000.

ORIGINAL PAPERS

BRCA1 and Estrogen Signaling in Breast Cancer

Amy M. Trauernicht and Thomas G. Boyer*

Department of Molecular Medicine and Institute of Biotechnology, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, 15355 Lambda Drive, San Antonio, TX 78245, USA

Abstract. Since the gene encoding BRCA1 was first cloned in 1994, researchers have sought to establish the molecular basis for its linkage to breast and ovarian cancer. As universal functions for this protein have emerged, questions persist concerning how its disruption can elicit cancer in a tissue- and gender-specific manner. Here, we review evidence that a functional interrelationship between BRCA1 and estrogen signaling may be involved in breast tumorigenesis.

INTRODUCTION

The National Cancer Institute reports that 1 in 8 women will develop breast cancer during her lifetime [1]. The high incidence of this disease therefore renders identification of risk factors and underlying causes a major focus of basic and clinically applied research. Although multiple factors influence a woman's lifetime risk for the development of breast cancer, family history is one of the most powerful prognostic indicators. Indeed, approximately 10% of all breast cancer cases can be linked to heritable transmission of an autosomal dominant allele [2].

Through linkage analysis of multiple families affected by early-onset breast and ovarian cancer, the first breast cancer susceptibility gene, *BRCA1*, was mapped to chromosome 17q21 in 1990 and cloned four years later [3,4]. At the same time, *BRCA2* was mapped to chromosome 13q and cloned shortly thereafter [5, 6]. Mutations in *BRCA1* are believed to account for 60–80% of hereditary breast and ovarian cancer cases and up to 15–20% of hereditary breast cancers only [7]. *BRCA2* mutations are linked to a similar percentage of inherited female breast cancers, but in contrast to mutations in *BRCA1*, they also predispose males to breast cancer [6]. Together, defects in these two genes ac-

count for approximately 40% of inherited breast cancers [7]. Germline inactivation of a single copy of *BRCA1* or *BRCA2* is sufficient to predispose an affected individual to cancer, while cancer onset is invariably accompanied by loss of the remaining allele [8]. Thus, *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* are tumor susceptibility genes that normally function to suppress tumor formation.

Because somatic mutations in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* are rare, it was originally assumed that neither gene plays an important role in the development of sporadic breast and ovarian cancers. However, recent studies indicate that epigenetic disruption of *BRCA1* or *BRCA2* function could represent a significant etiologic factor in sporadic disease [9].

While genetic or epigenetic inactivation of *BRCA1* or *BRCA2* is thus sufficient to induce cancer formation, emerging evidence suggests that disruption of these genes may induce tumorigenesis through distinct molecular pathways. First, *BRCA1*- and *BRCA2*-associated breast tumors are distinguishable histopathologically; whereas *BRCA1*-associated tumors are often high-grade cancers characterized by a high mitotic index and lymphocytic infiltrate, *BRCA2*-associated tumors are heterogeneous, relatively high grade, and generally display substantially less tubule formation [10,11]. Second, *BRCA1*-associated tumors are generally characterized by estrogen and progesterone receptor negativity, while *BRCA2*-associated tumors more commonly express these hormone re-

*Corresponding author: Thomas G. Boyer, Tel.: +1 210 567 7258; Fax: +1 210 567 7377; E-mail: boyer@uthscsa.edu.

ceptors [12]. Finally, distinct gene expression profiles characteristic of *BRCA1*- and *BRCA2*-associated tumors indicate distinct molecular phenotypes [13–15]. Together, these findings imply that *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* may participate in distinct pathways leading to breast and ovarian carcinogenesis.

The scope of this review will be restricted principally to the role of *BRCA1* in breast cancer. Following a brief summary of recent advances that extend our understanding of its generic biological function and regulation, we discuss recent evidence that links *BRCA1* to estrogen signaling and consider the possibility that this link represents an important etiologic factor in breast cancer development. The reader is referred to several recent reviews for a more comprehensive discussion of *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* in breast and ovarian cancer [16–19].

BRCA1 STRUCTURE AND EXPRESSION

The gene encoding *BRCA1* spans more than 100 kb of genomic DNA and comprises 24 exons, 22 of which encode a full-length isoform of 1863 amino acids [4]. In addition, several smaller *BRCA1* isoforms of variable size and tissue-specific expression patterns are produced, primarily through alternative splicing of exons 1 and 11 [20]. Exon 11, the largest exon, encodes roughly 60% of the protein and includes two putative nuclear localization sequences [20].

The full-length *BRCA1* isoform is a 220 kDa nuclear phosphoprotein [21,22]. At its amino terminus, *BRCA1* harbors a structurally conserved zinc-binding RING finger domain [4]. Consistent with the recent observation that otherwise diverse proteins harboring RING fingers can function as ubiquitin protein ligases, the *BRCA1* RING finger itself has been shown to exhibit ubiquitin ligase activity that is greatly stimulated by heterodimerization with a partner RING finger protein BARD1 [23,24].

At its carboxyl terminus, *BRCA1* carries two tandem copies of the BRCT (*BRCA1* Carboxyl Terminus) domain [25]. An autonomous folding unit defined by conserved clusters of hydrophobic amino acids, the BRCT domain is found in a diverse group of DNA repair and cell cycle control proteins, and likely functions as a protein interaction surface. Consistent with this notion, the BRCT domain in *BRCA1* represents an interface for a variety of proteins that are critical for its function in transcription control [26].

Developmentally, *BRCA1* is expressed in all tissues, but most highly in rapidly proliferating and differentiating cellular compartments; in the mouse mammary gland, these compartments include the terminal end buds during puberty and differentiating alveoli during pregnancy [27,28]. In addition, the unique temporal and tissue-specific pattern of *BRCA1* expression during prenatal development of the human mammary gland is consistent with a role for *BRCA1* in mammary gland morphogenesis and differentiation [29]. Furthermore, *BRCA1* expression is upregulated in mammary epithelial cells induced to differentiate *in vitro* [30], while forced reduction of *BRCA1* expression attenuates the *in vitro* differentiation of mammary epithelial cells, but not muscle or neuronal cells [31]. Taken together, these data imply a fundamental role for *BRCA1* in the control of mammary epithelial cell differentiation, although its precise role in this process remains to be established.

The induction of *BRCA1* expression coincident with differentiation in the mammary gland is not inconsistent with its possible regulation by estrogen, a major determinant of the growth and differentiation of mammary epithelial cells. In fact, data from early studies appeared to support this possibility. In the mammary gland, *BRCA1* expression was shown to be upregulated following treatment of ovariectomized mice with estradiol and progesterone [32], while estrogen-responsive MCF-7 and BT20T human breast cancer cells, cultured in the absence of estrogen, exhibited reduced *BRCA1* expression levels that could be reversed by the addition of estrogen [33,34]. However, subsequent studies revealed that estrogen indirectly regulates *BRCA1* expression by virtue of its mitogenic activity in promoting G1-S phase progression through the cell cycle. In cultured human mammary epithelial and cancer cell lines, *BRCA1* has been shown to be expressed cyclically; *BRCA1* mRNA and cancer cell lines, *BRCA1* has been shown to be expressed cyclically; *BRCA1* mRNA and protein expression levels peak during G1/S or early S-phase of the cell cycle concomitant with *BRCA1* phosphorylation [21,22]. The delayed kinetics of *BRCA1* induction following estrogen treatment parallels DNA synthesis and is therefore inconsistent with direct transcriptional regulation of *BRCA1* by estrogen [35]. Furthermore, *BRCA1* is expressed independently of hormonal stimulation in the mouse ovary and similarly in estrogen receptor-proficient and -deficient mice [36]. Collectively, these findings indicate that *BRCA1* is not itself a direct transcriptional target of estrogen.

BRCA1 FUNCTION

Insight into the biological function of BRCA1 has come from analyses of cells derived from BRCA1-mutant human breast tumors and embryos of mice carrying targeted deletions of the *BRCA1* gene. Invariably, BRCA1-deficient cells develop gross chromosomal abnormalities, typified by breaks, aberrant mitotic exchanges and aneuploidy [37,38]. These findings thus reveal BRCA1 to be cellular caretaker that suppresses genomic instability. Emerging evidence suggests that the underlying basis for this caretaker activity likely derives from the role of BRCA1 as a conduit in the cellular DNA damage response, wherein it serves to couple DNA damage-induced signals to downstream responses including DNA damage repair and cell cycle checkpoint activation.

BRCA1 AND DNA DAMAGE REPAIR

Evidence to implicate BRCA1 in the DNA damage response has come from the observation that BRCA1-deficient cells are hypersensitive to a variety of DNA damaging agents, including ionizing and ultraviolet radiation, and certain radiomimetic agents [18]. A more specific function for BRCA1 in DNA damage repair was suggested by the observation that BRCA1-deficient cells exhibit overt defects in the repair of chromosomal double-strand breaks by homologous and non-homologous recombination [39,40]. Further studies documenting complex formation between BRCA1 and DNA repair proteins, including RAD50/MRE11/NBS1, RAD51, MSH2, MSH6, and MLH1 have provided additional evidence to suggest the direct participation of BRCA1 in the DNA repair process itself [41–43].

BRCA1 IN CELL CYCLE CHECKPOINT CONTROL

DNA repair processes must be coordinated with control of cell cycle transit in order to ensure that damaged chromosomal DNA is repaired before it is replicated or segregated. There is considerable evidence to suggest that BRCA1 occupies a central and direct role in the activation of cell cycle checkpoints induced by DNA damage. First, BRCA1-mutant cells exhibit defects in DNA damage-induced S and G2/M cell cycle checkpoints [38,44]. Second, BRCA1 is rapidly

phosphorylated following DNA damage by cell cycle checkpoint kinases, suggesting that it may function downstream of DNA damage sensors that trigger cell cycle checkpoints [45–47]. Finally, *BRCA1* has been shown to regulate the expression of cell cycle checkpoint control genes, including p21 and GADD45 that function in G1/S and G2/M cell cycle checkpoints, respectively [48,49].

BRCA1 IN CELL GROWTH AND DIFFERENTIATION

Evidence to suggest that BRCA1 occupies a fundamental role in the control of cell growth and differentiation comes from the observation that homozygous deletion of murine *Brcal* results in early embryonic lethality accompanied by developmental retardation and cellular proliferation defects [50]. This phenotype can be explained in part by the role of *BRCA1* in the DNA damage response, since targeted deletions in *p53* or its downstream effector, *p21*, can delay the early embryonic lethality associated with homozygous *Brcal* deficiency [50]. While the delayed embryonic lethality accompanying inactivation of *p53* has been ascribed to the accumulation of gross chromosomal defects incompatible with life, the possibility also exists that *Brcal* is required for transit through a critical point later in the developing embryo.

Direct evidence to implicate BRCA1 in the regulation of cell growth and differentiation has come from analysis of transgenic mice carrying a *Brcal* allele that can be targeted for conditional inactivation specifically in the mammary gland. Mammary-specific inactivation of *Brcal* in female mice elicits defects in ductal morphogenesis and tumors associated with genetic instability, aneuploidy, and chromosomal rearrangements [51]. Thus, in addition to independent support for *BRCA1* as a breast tumor suppressor, this mouse model has also revealed a critical role for *BRCA1* in mammary development.

BRCA1 ACTIVITIES

Genetic studies have thus revealed *BRCA1* to be an essential tumor suppressor with critical functions in the cellular DNA damage response and cell growth and differentiation. In parallel, biochemical and molecular biological analyses have been conducted in order to understand how BRCA1 executes these functions. These analyses have linked BRCA1 to a variety of activities through which it might possibly mediate its biological functions.

BRCA1 IN TRANSCRIPTION CONTROL

A role for BRCA1 in transcriptional regulation was initially indicated by the observation that its BRCT domain manifests an inherent transactivation function that is sensitive to cancer-predisposing mutations [52]. Consistent with such activity, this region has been shown to interact with the basal transcription machinery as well as a variety of transcriptional co-activators, including the histone acetyltransferase p300, and the catalytic subunit of the chromatin remodeling SWI/SNF complex, hBRG1 [53–56]. Somewhat paradoxically, the BRCT domain also mediates the interaction of BRCA1 with transcriptional corepressors including the CtIP/CtBP complex and histone deacetylases (HDACs) [57,58]. These observations have prompted speculation that BRCA1 may function as a context-dependent transcription factor, one whose ability to function as an activator or repressor is determined by its associated cofactors.

Consistent with this possibility, recent studies utilizing gene expression profiling methodologies have revealed that ectopic overexpression of BRCA1 can induce or repress a diverse array of genes implicated in cell growth control, cell cycle regulation, apoptosis, and DNA replication and repair [49,59,60]. Thus, by virtue of its transcriptional regulatory activity, BRCA1 could influence cellular responses downstream of DNA damage-induced signals, including DNA repair and cell cycle checkpoint activation.

OTHER POTENTIAL ACTIVITIES OF BRCA1

The mechanistic basis by which BRCA1 participates in transcription and DNA damage repair processes remains to be established. Most BRCA1 in the cell resides in stable complex with additional proteins, and one possibility is that BRCA1 functions as a molecular scaffold that facilitates the assembly of multiprotein machines responsible for DNA damage repair and transcription. Alternatively, by virtue of its association with chromatin remodeling activities, BRCA1 could variably promote or disrupt nucleosome-mediated condensation of DNA at gene promoters and/or DNA damage sites, thus precluding or facilitating access of repair and transcription factors, respectively. Finally, recent studies have identified a ubiquitin ligase activity for BRCA1, thus raising the intriguing possibility that many of its pleiotropic activities could derive from the ability of BRCA1 to selectively mark proteins for de-

struction by the proteosome [23,61–63]. The identification of physiological substrates of BRCA1-targeted ubiquitination will represent an important area of future investigation.

BRCA1 AND TISSUE-SPECIFIC TUMOR SUSCEPTIBILITY

The DNA damage response pathways that converge on BRCA1 are likely universally conserved among different cell types, and BRCA1 is thus likely to function ubiquitously in the maintenance of genome integrity. Nonetheless, mutational inactivation of *BRCA1* leads principally to cancer of the female breast and ovary, and the underlying basis for its tissue- and gender-specific tumor suppressor properties remains poorly defined.

Several mutually compatible models have been proposed to explain how inactivation of BRCA1 could have restricted consequences in the breast and ovary. Because loss of heterozygosity at the *BRCA1* locus is a prerequisite for tumorigenesis, the frequency at which the second allele is lost in *BRCA1* mutation carriers could be higher in breast and ovarian, as opposed to other, epithelial cell populations [64]. Alternatively, breast and ovarian epithelial cells might own a unique proclivity for protracted survival in the absence of BRCA1, thereby permitting the accrual of secondary mutations critical for tumorigenesis [65]. On the other hand, recent data links BRCA1 to X chromosome heterochromatinization [66], suggesting that BRCA1 disruption could educe the overexpression of X-chromosome genes linked to breast and ovarian cancer. Finally, BRCA1 could fulfill a unique function in breast and ovary beyond its generally ubiquitous role as cellular caretaker, one whose disruption might promote tumorigenesis.

In this regard, BRCA1 has been shown to play a crucial role in the growth and differentiation of the mammary gland [30,51]. Furthermore, a considerable body of evidence supports a close relationship between mammary gland development and tumorigenesis. For example, it is well established that women who complete their first full-term pregnancy early in life carry a reduced lifetime risk of breast cancer [67]. The underlying basis for this protective effect is believed to derive from estrogen-induced differentiation and consequent elimination of epithelial cell structures most susceptible to malignant transformation [68]. Conceivably, mutational inactivation of BRCA1 could therefore perturb the normal program of mammary epithelial develop-

ment and foster conditions compatible with tumorigenesis. This possibility is consistent with the observation that mammary-specific inactivation of *BRCA1* in mice leads to defects in mammary gland development and tumor formation [51]. However, the fact that mammary tumor formation in these mice is characterized by low frequency and long latency suggests the involvement of additional genetic alterations, possibly arising from genetic instability accompanying *BRCA1* inactivation.

In this regard, the influence of steroid hormones, particularly estrogens, on the developing mammary gland is pertinent. The normal human mammary gland is comprised of a branching ductal system that develops under hormonal influences rudimentarily during puberty and only fully during pregnancy [69]. In the normal breast, estrogen elicits mammary ductal growth during adolescence as well as lobuloalveolar proliferation during pregnancy [70]. Because it is essential for the growth and proliferation of these epithelial cell structures, estrogen has been linked to the promotion and growth of breast cancer. Data from numerous studies suggest that estrogen can induce and promote breast cancer, while removal of the ovaries or administration of antiestrogens such as tamoxifen can oppose these effects [71–73]. However, it is also known that estrogens and their metabolic byproducts can be mutagenic, suggesting that estrogens may play an additional role in the initiation of tumor formation [74]. Based on its dual role in breast cancer risk, two hypotheses invoking estrogen action have been proposed to explain the tissue-restricted tumor suppressor function of *BRCA1*. Importantly, these two models are not mutually exclusive and could suggest a combinatorial path to breast cancer, since they invoke *BRCA1*-mediated control at two distinct steps of tumorigenesis – initiation and progression [75].

According to one model, mutational inactivation of *BRCA1* could render breast susceptible to the tissue-specific effects of estrogen-induced DNA damage. Consistent with this hypothesis is the observation that 4-hydroxyestradiol, a major oxidative metabolite of estrogen, is genotoxic [74]. Thus, mutations in *BRCA1* could compromise the response of breast epithelial cells to estrogen-induced DNA damage; this in turn could lead to genomic instability and a concomitant accrual of functionally inactivating mutations in other genes involved in breast tumorigenesis. In this way, *BRCA1* mutations might enhance the probability of tumor formation arising from estrogen-induced DNA damage.

A second model to explain the tissue-specific tumor suppressor activity of *BRCA1* invokes a role for *BRCA1*

in the modulation of estrogen signaling pathways and the control of cellular proliferation. The physiological effects of estrogen in the breast are mediated by cognate receptors that are expressed as two structurally related subtypes, estrogen receptor α (ER α) and β (ER β) [76]. These receptors are members of the nuclear receptor superfamily of ligand-activated transcription factors [77]. Activation of ER α and ER β by ligand binding elicits a conformational change in each receptor concomitant with dimerization and high-affinity binding to estrogen-response elements present within estrogen-responsive genes and through which the receptors promote high levels of transcriptional activation through targeted recruitment of co-activators and the RNA polymerase II transcription machinery [78,79].

BRCA1 was first shown to influence estrogen signaling by Rosen and colleagues, who observed that *BRCA1* was a potent inhibitor of the ligand-dependent transcriptional activity of ER α in cultured breast cancer cells [80]. This repression was shown to be selective for the ligand-dependent transcriptional activation function (AF-2) within ER α . Subsequently, this group provided mechanistic insight into *BRCA1* inhibition of ER α by showing that it occurs through a direct interaction between the N-terminus of *BRCA1* and AF-2 within ER α [81]. Importantly, tumor-associated mutations of *BRCA1* compromised its ability to inhibit ER α activity [81].

These initial reports were followed by the observation that *BRCA1* can also mediate ligand-independent transcriptional repression of ER α [82]. In *Brca1*-null mouse embryo fibroblasts and *BRCA1*-deficient human ovarian cancer cells, ER α was observed to exhibit ligand-independent transcriptional activity that could not be observed in *BRCA1*-proficient cells. Furthermore, ectopic expression in *Brca1*-deficient cells of wild-type *BRCA1*, but not clinically validated *BRCA1* missense mutants, restored ligand-independent repression of ER α in a manner dependent upon histone deacetylase activity. In human breast cancer cells, *BRCA1* could be found in association with ER α on endogenous estrogen-responsive gene promoters before, but not after, estrogen stimulation. Finally, attenuation of *BRCA1* expression in estrogen-dependent human ovarian cancer cells could be correlated with increases in both the estrogen-independent transcription of ER α -target genes and estrogen-independent cellular proliferation [82,83]. Based on these observations, it was proposed that *BRCA1* represents a ligand-reversible barrier to transcriptional activation by unliganded ER α . Coupled with previous studies by

Rosen and colleagues, these findings suggest a possible mechanism by which functional inactivation of BRCA1 could promote tumorigenesis through inappropriate hormonal regulation of mammary epithelial cell proliferation.

Several observations arising from these studies warrant further consideration. First, should BRCA1 function to inhibit the ligand-dependent transcriptional activity of ER α [80,81], it seems unlikely to do so through a mechanism that involves promoter-bound ER α , since chromatin immunoprecipitation analysis revealed the association of BRCA1 with ER α at endogenous estrogen-response elements prior to, but not following, estrogen stimulation [82]. This suggests that BRCA1 may inhibit ER α activity through alternative mechanisms. Second, the fact that BRCA1-mediated repression of both liganded and unliganded ER α is similarly abrogated by clinically validated BRCA1 missense mutations suggests that its ER α repression function is important for the biological activity of BRCA1 in breast tumor suppression.

Recently, a functional interaction between BRCA1 and ER α has been implicated in angiogenesis. Specifically, BRCA1 was shown to inhibit ER α -mediated transcriptional activation of vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) gene transcription and protein secretion [84]. The authors speculate that mutational inactivation of BRCA1 could promote tumor formation and angiogenesis through improper hormonal regulation of VEGF expression.

THE BRCA1/ER PARADOX

A function for BRCA1 in the modulation of estrogen signaling through inhibition of ER α activity could provide a basis to explain its linkage to breast cancer, which is an estrogen-dependent tumor type. However, it does not explain why BRCA1 mutations are linked to ovarian cancers, which are not primarily estrogen-dependent for growth. Nor does it explain why BRCA1 mutations are not implicated in the etiology of other estrogen-dependent tumor types, such as endometrial and cervical cancers. A possible explanation for these paradoxical observations could derive from the tissue-specific expression of nuclear receptor co-regulators that conversely facilitate or antagonize the function of BRCA1 as an inhibitor of ER α activity. In this regard, the transcriptional coactivator p300 was recently implicated in modulation of BRCA1-mediated ER α repression [85]. Furthermore, the ability of BRCA1

to repress ER α transcriptional activity correlated with its ability to down-regulate p300 levels in breast and prostate, but not cervical, cancer cells. Thus, BRCA1-mediated ER α repression may in part be dependent on tissue-specifically expressed cofactors.

It is well established that a significant proportion of BRCA1-associated breast tumors are negative for ER α expression [12,86], a clinical observation apparently incongruent with models invoking BRCA1 in the control of breast epithelial cell proliferation through modulation of ER α activity. A definitive explanation for this observation is precluded by a current lack of knowledge regarding how ER α -negative breast tumors arise. Several models have been proposed to explain the genesis of ER α -negative tumors, none of which precludes a possible link between BRCA1 and ER α as a factor in tumor development.

According to one model, ER α -negative tumors are hypothesized to arise from the loss of ER α expression during the clinical evolution of ER α -positive tumors [87,88]. In this case, it is possible that the loss of ER α expression is a relatively late event in breast tumor progression, one that may have occurred after any proliferative advantages conferred upon transformation-initiated cells by homozygous BRCA1 mutation have ensued. Alternatively, it has been proposed that ER α -negative and ER α -positive tumors are distinct entities that reflect the receptor status of their clonal origins [87, 89]. In this regard, recent data suggest a model in which proliferation of ER α -negative cells is controlled by paracrine growth factors secreted from ER α -positive cells in an estrogen-dependent manner [90-94]. In this case, BRCA1 disruption could promote the release from ER α -positive cells of growth factors that stimulate the proliferation of ER α -negative tumors. Finally, the recent discovery of ER β raises the possibility that this receptor mediates the proliferative response to estrogen in cells traditionally considered to be negative for ER expression [95,96]. In this regard, it has recently been determined that ER β is expressed during the immortalization and transformation of ER α -negative human breast epithelial cells [95]. The functional role of ER β -mediated estrogen signaling in the pathogenesis of breast cancer is currently unknown. Recently, it was reported that BRCA1 does not repress the ligand-dependent activity of ER β [16]. However, the possibility that BRCA1 modulates the ligand-independent activity of this estrogen receptor isoform has not yet been tested.

PERSPECTIVES

All available evidence to date suggests that endogenous exposure to female reproductive hormones is a principal determinant of breast cancer risk among *BRCA1* mutation carriers [7]. Consequently, the suggestion that *BRCA1* modulates estrogen signaling in the breast could have significant implications for the treatment of hereditary breast cancer with ER antagonists. In this regard, the use of tamoxifen as an adjuvant treatment for *BRCA1*-associated breast cancers has recently been evaluated in several large-scale retrospective clinical studies. Unfortunately, conflicting results have thus far been reported, thereby precluding a definitive assessment of the efficacy of tamoxifen in reducing hereditary breast cancer risk. An initial report from the Hereditary Breast Cancer Clinical Study Group (HBCCSG) that tamoxifen reduces the risk of contralateral breast cancer in *BRCA1* mutation carriers [97] was followed by a report from the US Breast Cancer Prevention trial (BCPT) that tamoxifen did not reduce breast cancer incidence among healthy *BRCA1* mutation carriers [98].

Several hypotheses have been proposed to explain the discordant results from these two studies. Because most *BRCA1*-associated breast cancers are ER-negative and tamoxifen is ineffective in the prevention and treatment of ER-negative breast cancers among women in the general population, a disproportionately high number of ER-positive *BRCA1*-associated breast cancers in the HBCCSG study could explain its contrasting results from those of BCPT [99]. However, more recent data suggests that tamoxifen can significantly reduce the risk of breast cancer mortality in *BRCA1*-mutation carriers irrespective of ER status [100]. These findings suggest that among ER-negative breast tumors, those arising in *BRCA1*-mutation carriers may respond differently to tamoxifen than those among women in the general population. Accordingly, earlier conclusions that tamoxifen has no role in the prevention or treatment of *BRCA1*-associated breast cancers may be premature.

A critical question regarding the potential prophylactic use of tamoxifen to reduce breast cancer incidence among *BRCA1*-mutation carriers concerns the appropriate age at which chemopreventive treatment should be initiated. Data from the BCPT analysis is not informative in this regard, since tamoxifen administration was initiated after age 35. Is it possible that tamoxifen could function prophylactically if administered at a younger age? Recent data from several clinical studies warrant consideration in this regard.

First, among *BRCA1*-mutation carriers, Rebbeck and colleagues reported that early (premenopausal) oophorectomy substantially reduces subsequent breast cancer risk, while Narod and colleagues observed that oophorectomy and tamoxifen independently reduce breast cancer risk to similar extents [97,101]. Consequently, early treatment with tamoxifen might be expected to reduce breast cancer incidence in *BRCA1*-mutation carriers. Second, recent work suggests that a principal risk factor for the development of hereditary breast cancer may be a heightened vulnerability of breast epithelium to the flood of hormones produced during puberty rather than a protracted exposure to ovarian hormones over the course of many years [102]. Thus, for genetically predisposed individuals, tumorigenic potential might be realized through a pathological response to physiological signals early in breast development. If this is true, might disruption of *BRCA1* elicit tumorigenesis by removing effective constraints on hormonal surges early in breast development? If so, effective chemoprevention in *BRCA1*-mutation carriers might require a means to reduce such vulnerability by antagonism of estrogen action for only a limited period but at a much earlier age than previously considered. Although purely speculative, this possibility is nonetheless consistent with established roles for *BRCA1* in the control of breast development and the modulation of estrogen signaling.

As a decade approaches since its initial discovery, essential and universal functions for *BRCA1* have been described. In the decade to come, we can anticipate that further disclosure of its biological activities will clarify the role of *BRCA1* as a breast tumor suppressor and identify suitable inroads for future intervention in breast cancer.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank our laboratory colleagues for advice and discussion, and P. Renee Yew for insight and comments. This work was supported by a National Institutes of Health Predoctoral Fellowship (A.M.T.), as well as National Institutes of Health Grant CA098301-01 and US Army Department of Defense Grant DAMD17-02-1-0584 (T.G.B.).

REFERENCES

- [1] Lifetime Probability of Breast Cancer in American Women. National Cancer Institute, http://cis.nci.nih.gov/fact/5_6.htm; 2002.

- [2] E.B. Claus, J.M. Schildkraut, W.D. Thompson and N.J. Risch, The genetic attributable risk of breast and ovarian cancer, *Cancer* **77** (1996), 2318–2324.
- [3] J.M. Hall, M.K. Lee and B. Newman et al., Linkage of early-onset familial breast cancer to chromosome 17q21, *Science* **250** (1990), 1684–1689.
- [4] Y. Miki, J. Swensen and D. Shattuck-Eidens et al., A strong candidate for the breast and ovarian cancer susceptibility gene BRCA1, *Science* **266** (1994), 66–71.
- [5] R. Wooster, S.L. Neuhausen and J. Mangion et al., Localization of a breast cancer susceptibility gene, BRCA2, to chromosome 13q12–13, *Science* **265** (1994), 2088–2090.
- [6] R. Wooster, G. Bignell and J. Lancaster et al., Identification of the breast cancer susceptibility gene BRCA2, *Nature* **378** (1995), 789–792.
- [7] R. Wooster and B.L. Weber, Breast and ovarian cancer, *N Engl J Med* **348** (2003), 2339–2347.
- [8] S.L. Neuhausen and C.J. Marshall, Loss of heterozygosity in familial tumors from three BRCA1-linked kindreds, *Cancer Res* **54** (1994), 6069–6072.
- [9] C.R. Mueller and C.D. Roskelley, Regulation of BRCA1 expression and its relationship to sporadic breast cancer, *Breast Cancer Res* **5** (2002), 45–52.
- [10] J.E. Armes, L. Trute and D. White et al., Distinct molecular pathogeneses of early-onset breast cancers in BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutation carriers: a population-based study, *Cancer Res* **59** (1999), 2011–2017.
- [11] Breast Cancer Linkage Consortium, Pathology of familial breast cancer: Differences between breast cancers in carriers of BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations and sporadic cases, *Lancet* **349** (1997), 1505–1510.
- [12] N. Loman, O. Johansson and P.O. Bendahl et al., Steroid receptors in hereditary breast carcinomas associated with BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutations or unknown susceptibility genes, *Cancer* **83** (1998), 310–319.
- [13] I. Hedenfalk, D. Duggan and Y. Chen et al., Gene-expression profiles in hereditary breast cancer, *N Engl J Med* **344** (2001), 539–548.
- [14] A.A. Jazaeri, C.J. Yee and C. Sotiriou et al., Gene expression profiles of BRCA1-linked, BRCA2-linked, and sporadic ovarian cancers, *J Natl Cancer Inst* **94** (2002), 990–1000.
- [15] L.J. van 't Veer, H. Dai and M.J. van de Vijver et al., Gene expression profiling predicts clinical outcome of breast cancer, *Nature* **415** (2002), 530–536.
- [16] E.M. Rosen, S. Fan, R.G. Pestell and I.D. Goldberg, BRCA1 gene in breast cancer, *J Cell Physiol* **196** (2003), 19–41.
- [17] A.R. Venkitaraman, Cancer Susceptibility and the Functions of BRCA1 and BRCA2, *Cell* **108** (2002), 171–182.
- [18] L. Zheng, S. Li, T.G. Boyer and W.H. Lee, Lessons learned from BRCA1 and BRCA2, *Oncogene* **19** (2000), 6159–6175.
- [19] P.L. Welcsh and M.C. King, BRCA1 and BRCA2 and the genetics of breast and ovarian cancer, *Hum Mol Genet* **10** (2001), 705–713.
- [20] C.R. De Potter, E.D. Coene and V.R. Schelfhout, Localization of BRCA1 protein at the cellular level, *J Mammary Gland Biol Neoplasia* **3** (1998), 423–429.
- [21] Y. Chen, A.A. Farmer and C.F. Chen et al., BRCA1 is a 220-kDa nuclear phosphoprotein that is expressed and phosphorylated in a cell cycle-dependent manner, *Cancer Res* **56** (1996), 3168–3172.
- [22] H. Ruffner and I.M. Verma, BRCA1 is a cell cycle-regulated nuclear phosphoprotein, *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **94** (1997), 7138–7143.
- [23] R. Baer and T. Ludwig, The BRCA1/BARD1 heterodimer, a tumor suppressor complex with ubiquitin E3 ligase activity, *Curr Opin Genet Dev* **12** (2002), 86–91.
- [24] K.L. Lorick, J.P. Jensen and S. Fang et al., RING fingers mediate ubiquitin-conjugating enzyme (E2)-dependent ubiquitination, *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **96** (1999), 11364–11369.
- [25] E.V. Koonin, S.F. Altschul and P. Bork, BRCA1 protein products ... Functional motifs, *Nat Genet* **13** (1996), 266–268.
- [26] C.X. Deng and S.G. Brodie, Roles of BRCA1 and its interacting proteins, *Bioessays* **22** (2000), 728–737.
- [27] T.F. Lane, C. Deng and A. Elson et al., Expression of Brca1 is associated with terminal differentiation of ectodermally and mesodermally derived tissues in mice, *Genes Dev* **9** (1995), 2712–2722.
- [28] S.T. Marquis, J.V. Rajan and A. Wynshaw-Boris et al., The developmental pattern of Brca1 expression implies a role in differentiation of the breast and other tissues, *Nat Genet* **11** (1995), 17–26.
- [29] F. Magdinier, N.D. Venezia, G.M. Lenoir, L. Frappart and R. Dante, BRCA1 expression during prenatal development of the human mammary gland, *Oncogene* **18** (1999), 4039–4043.
- [30] J.V. Rajan, M. Wang, S.T. Marquis and L.A. Chodosh, Brca2 is coordinately regulated with Brca1 during proliferation and differentiation in mammary epithelial cells, *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **93** (1996), 13078–13083.
- [31] M. Kubista, M. Rosner, E. Kubista, G. Bernaschek and M. Hengstschlager, Brca1 regulates in vitro differentiation of mammary epithelial cells, *Oncogene* **21** (2002), 4747–4756.
- [32] J.V. Rajan, S.T. Marquis, H.P. Gardner and L.A. Chodosh, Developmental Expression of Brca2 colocalizes with Brca1 and is associated with proliferation and differentiation in multiple tissues, *Developmental Biology* **184** (1997), 385–401.
- [33] J.M. Gudas, H. Nguyen, T. Li and K.H. Cowan, Hormone-dependent regulation of BRCA1 in human breast cancer cells, *Cancer Res* **55** (1995), 4561–4565.
- [34] M.A. Spillman and A.M. Bowcock, BRCA1 and BRCA2 mRNA levels are coordinately elevated in human breast cancer cells in response to estrogen, *Oncogene* **13** (1996), 1639–1645.
- [35] J.R. Marks, G. Huper and J.P. Vaughn et al., BRCA1 expression is not directly responsive to estrogen, *Oncogene* **14** (1997), 115–121.
- [36] K.W. Phillips, S.M. Goldsworthy and L.M. Bennett et al., Brca1 is expressed independently of hormonal stimulation in the mouse ovary, *Lab Invest* **76** (1997), 419–425.
- [37] M. Tirkkonen, O. Johansson and B.A. Agnarsson et al., Distinct somatic genetic changes associated with tumor progression in carriers of BRCA1 and BRCA2 germ-line mutations, *Cancer Res* **57** (1997), 1222–1227.
- [38] X. Xu, Z. Weaver and S.P. Linke et al., Centrosome amplification and a defective G2-M cell cycle checkpoint induce genetic instability in BRCA1 exon 11 isoform-deficient cells, *Mol Cell* **3** (1999), 389–395.
- [39] M. Jasin, Homologous repair of DNA damage and tumorigenesis: the BRCA connection, *Oncogene* **21** (2002), 8981–8993.
- [40] Q. Zhong, T.G. Boyer, P.L. Chen and W.H. Lee, Deficient nonhomologous end-joining activity in cell-free extracts from Brca1-null fibroblasts, *Cancer Res* **62** (2002), 3966–3970.

[41] Q. Zhong, C.F. Chen and S. Li et al., Association of BRCA1 with the hRad50-hMre11-p95 complex and the DNA damage response, *Science* **205** (1999), 747–750.

[42] Y. Wang, D. Cortez and P. Yazdi et al., BASC, a super complex of BRCA1-associated proteins involved in the recognition and repair of aberrant DNA structures, *Genes Dev* **14** (2000), 927–939.

[43] R. Scully, J. Chen and A. Plug et al., Association of BRCA1 with Rad51 in mitotic and meiotic cells, *Cell* **88** (1997), 265–275.

[44] B. Xu, S.T. Kim and M.B. Kastan, Involvement of Brca1 in S-phase and G(2)-phase checkpoints after ionizing irradiation, *Mol Cell Biol* **21** (2001), 3445–3450.

[45] D. Cortez, Y. Wang, J. Qin and S.J. Elledge, Requirement of ATM-dependent phosphorylation of Brca1 in the DNA damage response to double-strand breaks, *Science* **286** (1999), 1162–1166.

[46] J.S. Lee, K.M. Collins, A.L. Brown, C.H. Lee and J.H. Chung, hCds1-mediated phosphorylation of BRCA1 regulates the DNA damage response, *Nature* **404** (2000), 201–204.

[47] R. Scully, J. Chen and R.L. Ochs et al., Dynamic changes of BRCA1 subnuclear location and phosphorylation state are initiated by DNA damage, *Cell* **90** (1997), 425–435.

[48] K. Somasundaram, H. Zhang and Y.X. Zeng et al., Arrest of the cell cycle by the tumour-suppressor BRCA1 requires the CDK-inhibitor p21WAF1/Cip1, *Nature* **389** (1997), 187–190.

[49] D.P. Harkin, J.M. Bean and D. Miklos et al., Induction of GADD45 and JNK/SAPK-dependent apoptosis following inducible expression of BRCA1, *Cell* **97** (1999), 575–586.

[50] M.E. Moynahan, The cancer connection: BRCA1 and BRCA2 tumor suppression in mice and humans, *Oncogene* **21** (2002), 8994–9007.

[51] X. Xu, K.U. Wagner and D. Larson et al., Conditional mutation of Brca1 in mammary epithelial cells results in blunted ductal morphogenesis and tumour formation, *Nat Genet* **22** (1999), 37–43.

[52] A.N. Monteiro, A. August and H. Hanafusa, Evidence for a transcriptional activation function of BRCA1 C-terminal region, *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **93** (1996), 13595–13599.

[53] S.F. Anderson, B.P. Schlegel, T. Nakajima, E.S. Wolpin and J.D. Parvin, BRCA1 protein is linked to the RNA polymerase II holoenzyme complex via RNA helicase A, *Nat Genet* **19** (1998), 254–256.

[54] B.P. Schlegel, V.J. Green, J.A. Ladias and J.D. Parvin, BRCA1 interaction with RNA polymerase II reveals a role for hRNPB2 and hRNPB1alpha in activated transcription, *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **97** (2000), 3148–3153.

[55] G.M. Pao, R. Janknecht, H. Ruffner, T. Hunter and I.M. Verma, CBP/p300 interact with and function as transcriptional coactivators of BRCA1, *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **97** (2000), 1020–1025.

[56] D.A. Bochar, L. Wang and H. Beniya et al., BRCA1 is associated with a human SWI/SNF-related complex: linking chromatin remodeling to breast cancer, *Cell* **102** (2000), 257–265.

[57] X. Yu, L.C. Wu, A.M. Bowcock, A. Aronheim and R. Baer, The C-terminal (BRCT) domains of BRCA1 interact in vivo with CtIP, a protein implicated in the CtBP pathway of transcriptional repression, *J Biol Chem* **273** (1998), 25388–25392.

[58] R.I. Yarden and L.C. Brody, BRCA1 interacts with components of the histone deacetylase complex, *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **96** (1999), 4983–4988.

[59] T.K. MacLachlan, K. Somasundaram and M. Sgagias et al., BRCA1 effects on the cell cycle and the DNA damage response are linked to altered gene expression, *J Biol Chem* **275** (2000), 2777–2785.

[60] P.L. Welcsh, M.K. Lee and R.M. Gonzalez-Hernandez et al., BRCA1 transcriptionally regulates genes involved in breast tumorigenesis, *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **99** (2002), 7560–7565.

[61] H. Ruffner, C.A. Joazeiro, D. Hemmati, T. Hunter and I.M. Verma, Cancer-predisposing mutations within the RING domain of BRCA1: Loss of ubiquitin protein ligase activity and protection from radiation hypersensitivity, *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **98** (2001), 5134–5139.

[62] R. Hashizume, M. Fukuda and I. Maeda et al., The RING heterodimer BRCA1-BARD1 is a ubiquitin ligase inactivated by a breast cancer-derived mutation, *J Biol Chem* **276** (2001), 14537–14540.

[63] D.L. Mallery, C.J. Vandenberg and K. Hiom, Activation of the E3 ligase function of the BRCA1/BARD1 complex by polyubiquitin chains, *Embo J* **21** (2002), 6755–6762.

[64] A.N. Monteiro, BRCA1: the enigma of tissue-specific tumor development, *Trends Genet* **19** (2003), 312–315.

[65] S.J. Elledge and A. Amon, The BRCA1 suppressor hypothesis: an explanation for the tissue-specific tumor development in BRCA1 patients, *Cancer Cell* **1** (2002), 129–132.

[66] S. Ganesan, D.P. Silver and R.A. Greenberg et al., BRCA1 supports XIST RNA concentration on the inactive X chromosome, *Cell* **111** (2002), 393–405.

[67] B. MacMahon, P. Cole and T.M. Lin et al., Age at first birth and breast cancer risk, *Bull World Health Organ* **43** (1970), 209–221.

[68] J. Russo, G. Wilgus and I.H. Russo, Susceptibility of the mammary gland to carcinogenesis: I Differentiation of the mammary gland as determinant of tumor incidence and type of lesion, *Am J Pathol* **96** (1979), 721–736.

[69] J. Russo, Y.F. Hu, I.D. Silva and I.H. Russo, Cancer risk related to mammary gland structure and development, *Microsc Res Tech* **52** (2001), 204–223.

[70] O.M. Conneely, Perspective: female steroid hormone action, *Endocrinology* **142** (2001), 2194–2199.

[71] A. Benshushan and A. Brzezinski, Hormonal manipulations and breast cancer, *Obstet Gynecol Surv* **57** (2002), 314–323.

[72] W. Creasman, Estrogen and cancer, *Gynecol Oncol* **86** (2002), 1–9.

[73] I. Persson, Estrogens in the causation of breast, endometrial and ovarian cancers - evidence and hypotheses from epidemiological findings, *J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol* **74** (2000), 357–364.

[74] J.G. Liehr, Is estradiol a genotoxic mutagenic carcinogen? *Endocr Rev* **21** (2000), 40–54.

[75] Hilakivi-Clarke L. Estrogens, BRCA1, and breast cancer, *Cancer Res* **60** (2000), 4993–5001.

[76] J.F. Couse, S. Curtis Hewitt and K.S. Korach, Receptor null mice reveal contrasting roles for estrogen receptor alpha and beta in reproductive tissues, *J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol* **74** (2000), 287–296.

[77] M.J. Tsai and B.W. O'Malley, Molecular mechanisms of action of steroid/thyroid receptor superfamily members, *Annu Rev Biochem* **63** (1994), 451–486.

[78] J.M. Hall, J.F. Couse and K.S. Korach, The multifaceted mechanisms of estradiol and estrogen receptor signaling, *J Biol Chem* **276** (2001), 36869–36872.

[79] C.M. Klinge, Estrogen receptor interaction with co-activators and co-repressors, *Steroids* **65** (2000), 227–251.

[80] S. Fan, J. Wang and R. Yuan et al., BRCA1 inhibition of estrogen receptor signaling in transfected cells, *Science* **284** (1999), 1354–1356.

[81] S. Fan, Y.X. Ma and C. Wang et al., Role of direct interaction in BRCA1 inhibition of estrogen receptor activity, *Oncogene* **20** (2001), 77–87.

[82] L. Zheng, L.A. Annab, C.A. Afshari, W.H. Lee and T.G. Boyer, BRCA1 mediates ligand-independent transcriptional repression of the estrogen receptor, *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **98** (2001), 9587–9592.

[83] L.A. Annab, R.E. Hawkins, G. Solomon, J.C. Barrett and C.A. Afshari, Increased cell survival by inhibition of BRCA1 using an antisense approach in an estrogen responsive ovarian carcinoma cell line, *Breast Cancer Res* **2** (2000), 139–148.

[84] H. Kawai, H. Li, P. Chun, S. Avraham and H.K. Avraham, Direct interaction between BRCA1 and the estrogen receptor regulates vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) transcription and secretion in breast cancer cells, *Oncogene* **21** (2002), 7730–7739.

[85] S. Fan, Y.X. Ma and C. Wang et al., p300 modulates the BRCA1 inhibition of estrogen receptor activity, *Cancer Res* **62** (2002), 141–151.

[86] F. Eisinger, J. Jacquemier, C. Nogues, D. Birnbaum and H. Sobol, Steroid receptors in hereditary breast carcinomas associated with BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutations or unknown susceptibility genes, *Cancer* **85** (1999), 2291–2295.

[87] J. Russo, Y.F. Hu, X. Yang and I.H. Russo, Developmental, cellular, and molecular basis of human breast cancer, *J Natl Cancer Inst Monogr* **27** (2000), 17–37.

[88] L.A. Habel and J.L. Stanford, Hormone receptors and breast cancer, *Epidemiol Rev* **15** (1993), 209–219.

[89] S.H. Moolgavkar, N.E. Day and R.G. Stevens, Two-stage model for carcinogenesis: Epidemiology of breast cancer in females, *J Natl Cancer Inst* **65** (1980), 559–569.

[90] R.B. Clarke, A. Howell, C.S. Potten and E. Anderson, Dissociation between steroid receptor expression and cell proliferation in the human breast, *Cancer Res* **57** (1997), 4987–4991.

[91] R.B. Dickson, K.K. Huff, E.M. Spencer and M.E. Lippman, Induction of epidermal growth factor-related polypeptides by 17 beta-estradiol in MCF-7 human breast cancer cells, *Endocrinology* **118** (1986), 138–142.

[92] R.B. Dickson, M.E. McManaway and M.E. Lippman, Estrogen-induced factors of breast cancer cells partially replace estrogen to promote tumor growth, *Science* **232** (1986), 1540–1543.

[93] S.M. Snedeker, C.F. Brown and R.P. DiAugustine, Expression and functional properties of transforming growth factor alpha and epidermal growth factor during mouse mammary gland ductal morphogenesis, *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **88** (1991), 276–280.

[94] J. Russo, X. Ao, C. Grill and I.H. Russo, Pattern of distribution of cells positive for estrogen receptor alpha and progesterone receptor in relation to proliferating cells in the mammary gland, *Breast Cancer Res Treat* **53** (1999), 217–227.

[95] Y.F. Hu, K.M. Lau, S.M. Ho and J. Russo, Increased expression of estrogen receptor beta in chemically transformed human breast epithelial cells, *Int J Oncol* **12** (1998), 1225–1228.

[96] J.A. Gustafsson and M. Warner, Estrogen receptor beta in the breast: role in estrogen responsiveness and development of breast cancer, *J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol* **74** (2000), 245–248.

[97] S.A. Narod, J.S. Brunet and P. Ghadirian et al., Tamoxifen and risk of contralateral breast cancer in BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutation carriers: a case control study, *Lancet* **356** (2000), 1876–1881.

[98] M.C. King, S. Wieand and K. Hale et al., Tamoxifen and breast cancer incidence among women with inherited mutations in BRCA1 and BRCA2: National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project (NSABP-P1) Breast Cancer Prevention Trial, *JAMA* **286** (2001), 2251–2256.

[99] M. Robson, Tamoxifen for primary breast cancer prevention in BRCA heterozygotes, *Eur J Cancer* **38** (2002), S18–19.

[100] W.D. Foulkes, J. Goffin and J.S. Brunet et al., Tamoxifen may be an effective adjuvant treatment for BRCA1-related breast cancer irrespective of estrogen receptor status, *J Natl Cancer Inst* **94** (2002), 1504–1506.

[101] T.R. Rebbeck, A.M. Levin and A. Eisen et al., Breast cancer risk after bilateral prophylactic oophorectomy in BRCA1 mutation carriers, *J Natl Cancer Inst* **91** (1999), 1475–1479.

[102] A.S. Hamilton and T.M. Mack, Puberty and genetic susceptibility to breast cancer in a case-control study in twins, *N Engl J Med* **348** (2003), 2313–2322.